This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

3185.cc.1

Digitized by Google

ON

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

Digitized by Google

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

Digitized by Google

THE GENUINENESS

OF

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

ASSERTED ON EVIDENCE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL.

BY

J. CONWAY WALTER, B.A.

CURATE OF TRINITY CHAPEL,
BRIGHTON.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.
1863.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TO

THE AFTERNOON CONGREGATION

OF

TRINITY CHAPEL, BRIGHTON,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES,

THE FRUITS OF A PERIOD OF TEMPORARY WITHDRAWAL

(OWING TO INDISPOSITION)

FROM THE FULL DISCHARGE OF HIS MINISTRATIONS AMONG THEM,

AND DESIGNED TO

CONFIRM THEIR FAITH IN A PORTION OF

GOD'S WORD

WHICH HAS BEEN MUCH, BUT UNJUSTLY, ASSAILED,

ARE AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED

BY

J. CONWAY WALTER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THAT the Word of God should be an object of hostility, is in accordance with its own declarations. That the attacks made upon it should assume a deeper virulence as a spirit of independence, fostered to an unhealthy degree, spreads through the hearts of men —or an increased subtlety, as intellectual culture advances—were no less to be anticipated. Perhaps, however, the most dangerous feature in the ordeal to which the Bible is being subjected in our own day, is the manner in which the guise of friendship is, in many cases, made a cloak to hide the deadliest cuts at divine Truth.

There are, it is true, in the present awakened spirit of enquiry, elements of good, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated. That much valuable service has been done the cause of Truth by modern scientific and critical research, none can deny. That more may yet be done must be the hope of all. But *in and during the process*—when the rash friend is often too nearly allied to the bitter enemy; when the restraints and limitations due to the sacred character of the subject find little or no respect; when reverence

Digitized by Google

for the divine is often practically abjured; and criticism, emboldened by the success which has attended her treatment of ancient classic literature, ventures to employ her crucible to much the same purpose on the Volume of Inspiration — a profane hand laid on the Ark of God, even though under the plea of a friendly motive—what wonder if injurious effects ensue?

Though, then, the believer may comfort himself and be strong in the assurance that 'the Scripture cannot be broken;' that, though even 'heaven and earth may pass away' in the struggle, yet the true Word of God shall survive in unimpaired integrity, emerging finally, from the ordeal, purified by the fire, relieved, as far as may be, alike of misconceptions and mistranslations with which it has become encrusted, as also of textual corruptions with which it is engrained; still it should not be forgotten that, *meanwhile*, the ruin which cannot affect the Scripture itself may, and but too probably will, shake, and even destroy, the *faith of individual souls*; that though neither open opposition nor disguised treachery, each a formidable weapon in the hands of Satan, may overcome the height from which towers up the Word in all the majesty of divine strength, and victory must declare for it at last; yet that the battle-field below may be strewn with the dead and the dying—their numbers great in proportion to our remissness in defending the post. While, then, we may be ready—as indeed all must be who love the truth for the truth's sake—to wish a hearty God-speed to every attempt at bringing additional light, from whatever quarter, to bear upon so precious a possession as our Bible is; it also becomes a matter of paramount

Digitized by Google

importance for the welfare of souls, that we should acquire and impart such a fixedness in our principles, and such a general acquaintance with the evidence as to what *is* sure and reliable, that we may have the faith to hold by God's truth, and patiently abide the issue, unshaken by the multiplicity of conflicting theories and enquiries in agitation about us.

The present work then is a humble attempt to establish the genuineness of a portion of the divine Word, against which the hosts of assailants have rallied, and the tide of war has broken, again and again. Impregnable, indeed, the author believes the position of the Book of Daniel to be, as of any other book of Holy Scripture; yet the frequency and obstinacy of these attacks seem to him to call for the continual reiteration of the evidence of its strength.

For this purpose, however, he has not thought it necessary to undertake the refutation in detail of all the arguments which ingenuity may have employed against the book — arguments which are ever shifting their ground, and assuming new forms, as the old become untenable; but taking his stand on the book itself, as on holy ground, to shew its own subjective truth and strength. Still, in doing this, he has not unfrequently found himself, as it were, wielding the sword in one hand, while grasping the trowel in the other—though strengthening his own position, and making that his aim, yet at the same time, by a kind of bystroke, rebutting an enemy's blow as well. So that the reader will here find the chief objections of opponents all, in this way, incidentally touched upon and stated.

In the historical part of the book's defence there was

Digitized by Google

little room for originality. The author has merely epitomised and arranged materials lying scattered over the works of several different writers, and there, in many cases, encumbered with so much, either of irrelevant matter, or of prolonged discussion, as would exclude them from the knowledge of the general reader. These sources of information are all fully indicated in the foot notes. Of the series of arguments forming the Internal Evidence, many are such as might occur to anyone, on a thoughtful perusal of the Book of Daniel itself; some are based upon the results of modern scientific enquiry; and some again originated in the thoughts and language employed by others, generally with a different object, but which the author judged to have a no less significant bearing on the subject in hand. Whenever he has been indebted to others, he has been careful to acknowledge it. On the whole he hopes that he has produced, in a plain but comprehensive form, a summary, intelligible to all, of the chief testimony in the book's favour. If the result should, in any case, conduce to the confirmation of individual faith in a portion of God's Word, at a time when the religious and intellectual world seems to be undergoing a general upheaval — the forms of thought and opinion on many subjects in a state of transition, the old *silting* away, or in danger of it, as new phenomena arise — that which has been to himself a labour of love, will not have been undertaken in vain.

While the sheets of the present volume have been passing through the press, the author has become acquainted with a valuable work, just published, on the same subject—*The inspiration of the Book of Daniel, by W. R. A. Boyle, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister*, — and

Digitized by Google

though he has never himself entertained a doubt on the matter, it is still satisfactory to him to know that his own conclusions have been so fully confirmed by one whose legal training has especially fitted him for a just appreciation of the value of the existing evidence.

It may perhaps prepare the reader for a more intelligent perusal of the following pages, briefly to state here the substance of the charges which have been brought against the book they are designed to defend.

Porphyry, who lived about A.D. 233–305,[1] wrote a work, entitled 'Against the Christians,' the 12th and 13th books of which were devoted to the examination of the prophecies of Daniel; and he alleged that their minute agreement with the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes was such as proved that they must have been composed *after* those events had taken place; in other words that the book belonged to a period later by 400 years than the date at which Daniel himself must have flourished—consequently, that it was a forgery. This argument, supported by other collateral ones, some of which, it is probable, were suggested by doubts thrown out by Spinoza, was revised by the English deist, Collins, in the last century. His views again were adopted, in Germany, by Michaelis and Eichhorn, and more recently, to a large extent especially by Bertholdt, Bleek, Gesenius, Von Lengerke, De Wette, Kerms, Scholl, Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald, Lücke, and others. To whom may be added our own Arnold; and lately Dr. Williams, in the work entitled, 'Essays and Reviews.' Though varying in the grounds on which they are based, the allegations of these several

[1] See Lardner's Works, vol. viii. pp. 185—204, 8vo ed., and Neander's Kirchengesch. i. 290.

Digitized by Google

writers (which it is unnecessary to specify fully here, as they will appear in the body of the work) amount in the main, to the same charge, viz. that the book is a forgery.

On the other hand, there have not been wanting defenders of the book. Collins was answered, and fully, by Bishop Chandler and Dr. Samuel Chandler; as also, though briefly, by Bishop Newton, in his work on the Prophecies. More recently the same line has been taken, and at greater length, by Hengstenberg, Sach, Hävernick, Reichel, Keil, Schulze, Delitzch, Vaihinger, Auberlen, and others, in Germany; in America, by Professor Stuart and Barnes; and in our own country, by Tregelles, Davidson, Ayre (the two latter in their editions of Horne's 'Introduction'), and many others on a smaller scale. None of these writers, however, have attempted to work out the *internal* evidence to the extent of which it seems capable. It will be seen that it is more especially to this part of the subject the author of the present work has given his attention; supported, as he is, in his opinion of the importance of this kind of proof, by the precedents of men of such calibre as Paley, and the late learned Professor Blunt. With what degree of success his humble endeavours have been attended, he must leave to others to pronounce. Fully persuaded, however, he is, in his own mind, that should his arguments, on perusal, not be deemed convincing, it is not because the book itself is wanting in the materials of conviction, but because he has himself failed to do them justice.

BRIGHTON: *August* 1863.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE . . . . . vii—xii

PART I.

THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF THE BOOK'S GENUINENESS FROM ITS *ANTECEDENT* PROBABILITY . . . . . 1—24

PART II.

EVIDENCE OF THE BOOK'S GENUINENESS DRAWN *INDIRECTLY* FROM THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK ITSELF, ITS LANGUAGE, STYLE, MATTER, &C. . . . . 27—173

PART III.

THE *HISTORICAL* TESTIMONY, TRACING THE EXISTENCE OF THE BOOK UP TO A TIME WHEN FORGERY WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE 177—202

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART I.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL:

ITS ANTECEDENT PROBABILITY.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART I.

THE GEOLOGIST who discovers the remains of some monster of a pre-Adamitic world embedded in the rock, which has preserved its fossil framework through ages yet untold, is not unfrequently disappointed, as with nervous interest he slowly lays it bare from the overlying stratum, to find that, lost perhaps, or destroyed by unskilful hands in the very attempt to unveil it, some main part is wanting, without which the symmetry of the whole is incomplete. There lie before him the head, the limbs, the ribs, distinctly traceable; but in the vertebræ of that dorsal column, about which the whole seems to have clustered as once the centre of its strength and unity, there is a gap he cannot fill—a link in the chain is wanting.

Analogous to the position of the geologist in such a case, though incomparably more momentous in its consequences, is that of the believer who finds himself, by the pseudo-criticism of modern enlightenment, robbed, if he is to credit it, of an important portion of what he has hitherto deemed the Word of God. Nor, in the case of the book of which I am about to treat, will this be only the result of association, in one who, from his earliest years, has been taught to study and regard the Bible in its entirety as the most precious heirloom, as

Digitized by Google

well as the Palladium of a Christian. On other grounds besides these he will feel that a vacuum is thus created, which is abhorrent no less to the nature of the Bible itself than to his own long-cherished creed; that there is in the scheme of Revelation a place fitted and designed for the book of Daniel; and that if it be withdrawn from the body of which it has so long formed a part, a blank will be left, for the filling up of which the materials are otherwise missing. Here then is an *antecedent* argument for the genuineness of this book. It supplies certain *desiderata* which are not to be found elsewhere. We meet with phenomena, doctrinal and historical, in other parts of Scripture, which are only to be accounted for on the supposition that a book of this character once formed a portion of the acknowledged Word of God. This book, or one in many respects similar to it, is necessary to them. It supplies a want. It is not an accidental portion of the Bible, without connection with the rest; but, like the missing vertebra, it has its own appropriate place, into which it fits in such a manner as shows that it belongs to it, that it is an integral part of the whole—a vital link in that series, through which, as it were, runs the spinal chord of inspiration; the removal of the link necessarily breaking the continuity of the thread.

I proceed then, in this first part of my defence of the genuineness of the book of Daniel, to show that there actually exists a connection of this kind, by collecting sundry passages scattered about the Word of God, which apparently owe their presence there, certainly much of their significance, to the influence of this book, or of its reputed author, Daniel the prophet.

The first passages of this nature, which I may mention, are to be found in Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20, and

Digitized by Google

xxviii. 3. In each of these places the prophet refers to an individual named Daniel, evidently as one *well known*; in the former passage (xiv. 14, 20), describing him as remarkable for his righteousness, in the latter (xxviii. 3) for his wisdom. Now Ezekiel is known to have written at the time of the Babylonish captivity; it is clear, therefore, that the Daniel of whom he speaks must have flourished either at that period or earlier, unless indeed he were a fictitious character, which, as we shall see further on, is highly improbable.[1] Yet there are no traces in Scripture of any Daniel existing before the period of the captivity, who answers at all to the description implied in these two brief but significant references of Ezekiel. If, then, we are to omit the book of Daniel from our canon of Scripture as spurious, we have no scriptural explanation of the language of Ezekiel in these passages. The Noah and the Job of whom he speaks are both well-known Scripture characters, but the Daniel he alludes to is (in that case) unknown. On the other hand admit the genuineness of the book of Daniel, and we are then supplied with the exact counterpart of the description given by Ezekiel; so righteous that even enemies confess they can find no fault in him (Dan. vi. 5); so wise, that when a mere stripling he is advanced over the heads of all the professional wise men of Babylon; and as living in the same country, and at the same time as Ezekiel himself, likely also to be known to him, as to other Jewish captives.

Nor is this by any means all. A closer examination

[1] This is evident, from the manner in which Ezekiel speaks of him throughout, as one well known to all; apart from the evidence as to the individuality of Daniel, which comes out continually in our investigation of the book of Daniel, in Part II. (See §§ i. iii. x. xvi. *et ubique.*)

Digitized by Google

of the particular *design* of these allusions in the book of Ezekiel, will discover a still further applicability to the Daniel of the captivity, as the book of Daniel represents him to us. To look first at Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20, the doctrine here intended to be especially enforced, is the inefficacy of intercession beyond a certain point. The prophet has been saying that when the measure of a nation's iniquity is full, when it has sinned beyond what the long-suffering of a just God can pardon, His judgements must then have their course; and in ver. 14 (and again in ver. 20), as though to give a greater emphasis to the Divine abhorrence of sin, he adds that no longer, in such an extreme case, shall the intercession even of such men as Noah, Daniel, and Job, be of any avail; 'they shall deliver their own souls,' but nothing more. Now wherein is the appropriateness of the special reference to these three individuals? In a corresponding passage in Jeremiah (xv. 1), Moses and Samuel are the two singled out in a similar manner; and God, in speaking of His estrangement from His people, the Jews, is made to say, 'Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people.' Now Moses had on more than one occasion successfully pleaded with God, for the offending Israelites (as in Ex. xxxii. 31–34; Num. xiv. 13–20); it was also in consequence of the intercession of Samuel that they were delivered from their enemies the Philistines, as related in 1 Sam. vii. 8–10; and David (Ps. xcix. 6) especially refers to these two, as men who had been successful in their intercession with God. There is then clearly a motive for the particular reference in this passage of Jeremiah; and the idea intended to be conveyed is this: that when the nation's iniquity had attained to that excessive pitch, not even the advocacy

Digitized by Google

of men, whose intercession had been hitherto signally successful, should then avail to avert its punishment. And now, in the case of Ezekiel's reference to Noah, Daniel, and Job, it is at least likely that where the argument is manifestly identical the reference also should be something similar. Can we discover it to be so? From Gen. viii. 20–22, and ix. 11–17, we gather that it was in consequence of Noah's propitiatory sacrifice, offered after coming out of the ark, that God made with him the covenant, that He would never again visit the earth with a flood. Here was a notable instance of successful intercession. Again Job was appointed by God Himself, to intercede with Him on behalf of his three friends (Job xlii. 8, 9), which he did with success. This surely is enough to furnish us with a key to the design of the reference to Daniel. In the four instances thus far considered, the persons mentioned were those who had pleaded with God for others, and whose intercession had been signally successful. Withdraw the book of Daniel, and, though four of these allusions are accounted for, we are without any explanation of the fifth; and whereas in the passage itself (Ezek. xiv. 14, 20), the individual referred to is plainly mentioned as one well known, yet (in that case) we are entirely ignorant of any such person beyond what is said by Ezekiel himself, or of any act of intercession on his part which could justify Ezekiel in introducing him in such company. But now let us look at the book of Daniel, and light is thrown on the matter at once. In ch. ix. we actually find him pleading with God for his people, as the hour for their destruction drew near; and though this was more than fifty years after the delivery of the particular prophecy of Ezekiel, with which we are now dealing, yet the circumstance is at least valuable, as

Digitized by Google

showing his *habit* of prayerful communion with God: a habit, indeed, of which we have other and earlier indications, as in ch. vi. where he is thrown into the lions' den for adhering to it, and at an earlier period still—and one with which we may well suppose Ezekiel to be familiar—when, as recorded in ch. ii. it is only after earnest prayer and meditation by night, that he is empowered to interpret the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. And can we suppose that he who was thus habitually and systematically a man of prayer, and besides so deeply interested in the welfare of his captive countrymen, as his conduct shows him to have been, would neglect to make their well-being a subject of intercession? that he, whose first act, on being advanced to high office, was to secure the promotion of three other Jewish captives (Dan. ii. 49), would fail to use his influence with God, or his sovereign, in behalf of the Jews generally? On the contrary, the condition of comfort, and even affluence, to which, as we gather from sundry indications, the Jews must speedilyhave attained in Babylon—so great, indeed, that when the period of the captivity expired, the majority of them declined to return to Jerusalem—would certainly imply that they had met with favourable treatment from the Babylonian sovereigns, such as only can be accounted for, by supposing that powerful interest was exerted on their behalf; and who so likely to have taken the lead in this as the Daniel of the book before us? Assume the description of him, found in this book, to be a true one, and we have a most minute accordance with the object for which his name is employed by Ezekiel.

Let us now turn to the other mention of Daniel found in Ezekiel (xxviii. 3), and we shall discover a further confirmation of what has been said. In a

Digitized by Google

prophetic apostrophe, addressed to the king of Tyre, Ezekiel is describing the manner in which that king exalted himself; and he exclaims with language of irony, 'Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel: there is no secret that they can hide from thee.' Here again, as before, Daniel is referred to as a character well known; yet if the book of Daniel is to be expunged from the Bible, we know nothing of him at all beyond these scattered allusions. But allow its genuineness, and we then have the exact counterpart of this description,—the features which fill in these outlines. The words forming the latter half of the verse just quoted, are almost a verbal parallel to the language of Nebuchadnezzar to Daniel (Dan. ii. 47), 'Of a truth it is that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a *revealer of secrets*, seeing that thou couldest reveal this secret.' Ezekiel, it is to be observed, apparently speaks of this Daniel, as one who would be known to the king of Tyre, at least by hearsay, which would hardly be the case, were he only a *private* Jewish captive, or a Jew who lived in Judæa at an earlier date. But if, as is represented in the book of Daniel, he were in high office in Babylon, and in favour with Nebuchadnezzar, then he might well be known throughout the whole East.[1] The prophecy may, however, never have been designed actually to reach the ear of the king of Tyre; yet even in that case there still remains the fact, that Daniel is spoken of as one who was proverbial for his wisdom. Thus does Ezekiel 'set to his seal' of independent testimony, to the truth of our book; helping us, too, to identify the Daniel there described with a

[1] Compare the manner in which the fame of Mordecai spread throughout 'all the provinces' (Esth. ix. 4).

Digitized by Google

real personage, well known to persons of that day, and so rescuing him from the shallow hypothesis of modern sciolists, that he is only a fictitious character, invented by the writer of the book of Daniel for the occasion.[1] These references of Ezekiel are as footprints found upon the sand, whose very presence, where they are discovered, necessarily involves the existence of an individual to produce them; that original I think we are justified in considering with great probability, to be presented to us in the author of the book of Daniel.

We should observe, too, that if there ever was such a person as the Daniel of whom Ezekiel in these passages makes mention, we should look for some results of his preeminent wisdom. But take away the book of Daniel, and we have none. Of the three persons mentioned by Ezekiel as equally distinguished for their piety, Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and the chosen instrument for preserving our race from extinction by the flood; Job has left us one of the most remarkable of the books of the Old Testament; but (apart from the book before us) Daniel's righteousness and unparalleled wisdom have been, for others at least, wasted and barren. On the other hand, allow the book of Daniel to be his, and we have then a production worthy of the character here assigned to him. From Ezekiel's allusions to the unusual nature of his wisdom and righteousness, we should expect that these qualities would stamp themselves on any production of his. The book of Daniel as we have it, undeniably bears the impress of both.

The portions of the Old Testament which were written at the time of, or subsequent to, the Babylonish

[1] De Wette, *Lehrbuch*, p. 390. Ed. Berlin, 1845.

Digitized by Google

captivity, and in which therefore it would be possible for notices of Daniel to appear (assuming him to have lived at that period, which we have already seen to be probable, from the fact that he is mentioned by Ezekiel, but not by any earlier writer), are not many;[1] it would, therefore, not be surprising if there were no other references to Daniel to be found than those of Ezekiel. There are, however, traces of an acquaintance with the book of Daniel, in three of these later books, not indeed put prominently forward, but discovering themselves in that indirect manner, which is the surest sign of genuine truthfulness. Hofmann and Baumgarten, the latter at considerable length,[2] have shown that the four horns, and carpenters, and the four chariots of Zechariah's vision (i. 18–21; vi. 1–8) refer to the four world monarchies of Daniel. 'Zechariah,' says Auberlen, 'clearly presupposes a knowledge of the contents and details of Daniel's prophecies.' He adds, too, that 'it is only in the light of this connection that the prophecy concerning Javan or Greece (Zech. ix. 13, &c.) can be understood.' The same writer observes that the prayers of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezr. ix. 6, &c.; Neh. i. 5, &c.) 'breathe so much of the spirit of Daniel's prayer of repentance, that Hitzig (p. 144) remarks that the ninth chapter of Daniel bears so close an affinity to the first and ninth of Nehemiah, that the one writer must have written in dependence on the other;' and he seems to think it probable that we have here the reason why the collectors of the Old Testament canon placed the book

[1] They are: Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; the two books of Chronicles are also generally considered to have been compiled by Ezra.

[2] Referred to by Auberlen, *On Daniel and the Apocalypse*, Engl. Transl. p. 47.

Digitized by Google

of Daniel immediately before Ezra and Nehemiah in the Hagiographa; a circumstance, the significance of which would be more striking still, if, in accordance with the Jewish tradition, Ezra was himself the collector.[1] Here, then, we again have features occurring in books of the Old Testament, which *require* for their full explanation the preexistence of the book of Daniel as a work of authority. If we set that book aside as a spurious production, these others also suffer loss, and we involve ourselves in difficulties considerably greater than any which arise from the assumption of the book's genuineness.[2]

I now pass on to the evidence bearing on our subject to be found in the New Testament. The following observations, however, will have little weight with any but those who believe in the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament. But since these are points which have been established, to the fullest extent that proof is possible, I shall here regard them as conceded,

[1] Auberlen, *On Daniel and the Apocalypse*, pp. 130, 131. Engl. Transl.

[2] It would not be difficult to show a connection existing between the book of Daniel and parts of the Bible written *anterior* to the age to which we regard his book as belonging. This appears in the developement of the prophecy of Balaam, found in this book; in which, viz. Balaam's prophecy, Auberlen (on Dan. and Apoc. p. 45) says, 'we find the germ and rude outlines of what is spread before our eyes in Daniel, in grand and finished pictures.' We see it again in the agreement and similarity existing between the prayer of Daniel in ch. ix., and that of Moses in Deut. ix. But since it may be objected that such accordance might be produced by anyone, and would be aimed at by an impostor, I shall not enter on this subject, though it certainly has its value, as connecting the book with what precedes as well as with what follows—the cords of the tent *run out* as it were, *behind* as well as *before*, to rivet it to its ground, as the Word of God.

Digitized by Google

and draw my arguments from different parts of the New Testament as from inspired sources.

Regarding the subject in this light, it might appear at once sufficient to say, that since our Saviour[1] quotes the book before us as that of 'Daniel the prophet,' its inspiration and genuineness cannot be doubted. But inasmuch as we may be here met by the rejoinder, mistaken though we believe it to be, that He might speak thus from force of habit, and not as critically pronouncing His judgement on the book's genuineness,[2] I do not press this language beyond what it does undeniably show; viz. that, to take the lowest view of it, we are justified in saying that the Saviour regarded Daniel with reverence; that He spoke of him as an inspired man; that He quoted this book as his production, and as foretelling events yet future to Him and His disciples of that day.

I pass on to other and less direct testimony, often, indeed, the more convincing, when once pointed out, in proportion to its indirectness; and I think we shall see that in several instances the book of Daniel supplies *desiderata*, as I have said before, which would otherwise be lacking altogether. Among the peculiarities which distinguish this book from others of the Old Testament, and which have therefore been adduced as furnishing arguments against its genuineness, two of the principal are its distinct enunciation of the doctrine of the general resurrection (xii. 2), and its representations of the ministry and titles of the angels. I reserve, indeed, to a

[1] Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14. The words he quotes occur in Dan. ix. 27; xii. 11.

[2] This is the ground on which De Wette demurs to the arguments based on the recognition of this book by our Saviour. *Einleit.* § 255 (3).

Digitized by Google

subsequent period the discussion of the angelology of the book of Daniel, so far as such discussion enters into the plan of the present work, when I trust to be able to show satisfactorily that this feature of the book instead of militating against its genuineness, is rather confirmatory of it: while at present I merely observe that the language of the New Testament on both these subjects would lead us to suppose that they had been put forward with greater distinctness in the Old Testament, than we anywhere find to have been the case, except in the book of Daniel. Remove that book from the canon of Scripture and we have no Old Testament parallels to the language of the New, on these particular subjects; assume its genuineness, and then the doctrine of the New Testament on these points is substantiated as fully as we could wish.

To take the two subjects separately.

Our Saviour in a conversation with the Sadducees [1] reproves them for their disbelief in the resurrection, in these words, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,' &c. It is clear, therefore, that He considered this doctrine as having been distinctly revealed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Now, there are various passages which allude to it, in language more or less definite, scattered about the Old Testament,[2] but none, if we except the book of Daniel, which are not couched in terms by which the doctrine is rather left to be inferred, than distinctly stated; in some only appearing as a secondary idea. But in the book of Daniel it is so plainly set forth (xii. 2) that knowing, if they did so, the declarations of that book, the Sadducees would be

[1] Matt. xxii. 29.

[2] See Job xix. 25–27; Ps. xvi. 9, 10; xvii. 5; Is. xxvi. 19; lxvi. 24; Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14; Hos. xiii. 14; *et alibi.*

Digitized by Google

without excuse for any doubt on the matter,[1] and so justly merit the rebuke of Christ. And we can hardly doubt that He who quoted this book as the production of 'Daniel the prophet,' had this very passage (Dan. xii. 2) amongst others in His mind at the time He uttered this rebuke. It is clear that He regards the doctrine of the resurrection as plainly discoverable in the Old Testament. The plainest passage of all is in the book before us. Remove that, and the doctrine is in all the others more or less obscure. The book of Daniel, therefore, seems almost necessary as a part of the inspired Word of God, in order to justify this rebuke administered by our Saviour to the Sadducees.

Again on the other subject to which I have alluded: we find mention made of the angels Gabriel and Michael in the New Testament,[2] in a manner which has no parallel in the Old, if the book of Daniel be not a part of it. They are introduced by name almost without explanatory comment, or only with just so much as would imply a previous knowledge of them; yet in no canonical book of the Old Testament are they mentioned by name, except in the book of Daniel.[3] Assume that book to be genuine, and then the abrupt manner in which these heavenly ministers are ushered in by the writers of the New Testament is at once

[1] The argument by which our Saviour refutes the Sadducees (see Matt. xxii. 29) is by no means so forcible an one as He might have selected. But in dealing with those who acknowledged no part of the Scripture as of equal importance with the Pentateuch—though we have no ground for supposing that they *rejected* all Scripture but the Pentateuch, see Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. 'Canon' II. (β)—He was, to some extent, excluded from the strongest passages which occurred in other parts of Scripture.

[2] Luke i. 19, 26; Jude 9; Rev. xii. 7.

[3] Dan. viii. 16; ix. 21; x. 13; xii. 1.

Digitized by Google

accounted for; for they have already been introduced to the knowledge of believers by a prophet of the Lord. Nay, there is, further, so close a correspondence between the nature of their respective ministries, as revealed in the visions of Daniel and under the New Dispensation, as is not sufficiently pointed to have been the result of design, but such as springs unconsciously from truth. While in the Gospel of St. Luke,[1] Gabriel is the messenger employed to announce the birth of the Saviour (and that of His forerunner, John the Baptist), in the book of Daniel[2] his errand is to interpret the vision predictive of the same event. Michael, in the New Testament, is only mentioned twice: once[3] as contending with the Devil for the body of Moses; in the other case[4] as expelling Satan and his fellow angels from heaven. So in the book of Daniel[4] it is Michael who carries on the struggle with success against the wicked spirits presiding over the kingdoms of heathenism; and this warfare he carries on there, in behalf of God's people, the Jews, as St. Jude represents him doing for the body of Moses. On both these subjects, then, the book of Daniel not only appears to have the sanction of the New Testament, but to have itself formed a basis or background for some of the expressions found in the New Testament with reference to them. And as we can only comprehend this on the supposition of its inspiration being acknowledged, so it evidently implies that this book has its appropriate place in the scheme of Divine revelation; and that if we set it aside, there is a void produced which we have no other means of filling.

But there are several other references to our book,

[1] Luke i. 11, 19, 26. [2] Dan. ix. 24-27.
[3] Jude 9. [4] Rev. xii. 7. [5] Dan. x. 13; xii. 1.

Digitized by Google

besides these, in the New Testament; indeed it has more than an average share of notice there. Our Saviour, for instance, continually appropriates to Himself the title of 'the Son of Man;' which, though it occurs frequently in the Old Testament, is nowhere used in the sense in which He employs it, except in one passage of the book of Daniel (vii. 13), 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like *the Son of man* came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.' Here, there can be no doubt, from an examination of the whole passage, that the writer is alluding to the future Messiah; while that it is also from this passage, the Saviour Himself borrows the expression is evident, since on the most solemn occasion,[1] and when adjured 'by the living God' to declare whether He be the Christ or not, in reply He not only uses this title, 'Son of Man,' but also adopts some of the language here accompanying it: 'Hereafter shall ye see the *Son of man* sitting on the right hand of power, and *coming in the clouds of heaven*.[2] And that this was, at the time, recognised as an appropriation of the language of Holy Scripture to Himself, in the sense in which the writer of Daniel employs it, is clear from the conduct of the chief priest immediately on His pronouncing these words; for 'then,' St. Matthew tells us, 'the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now

[1] Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.

[2] The language of St. Stephen (Acts vii. 56) is also evidently drawn from that of Daniel. Lightfoot (quoted by Hengstenberg, Authenticity of Daniel, p. 223) says: 'Stephanus in his verbis allegat *illud Danielis* vii. 13;' and so of the converse Fleck also says, 'Filius hominis Danieliticus=Messias.' De Regno Divino, p. 121.

Digitized by Google

ye have heard his blasphemy.' The two expressions here adopted by the Saviour from the book of Daniel occur again in the Apocalypse of his beloved disciple,[1] and this time also in connection with each other, as referring to the same Divine object. Again in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[2] there is a plain reference to the events recorded in chaps. iii. and vi. of the book of Daniel—where, among a catalogue of the faithful of earlier times, St. Paul enumerates those 'who stopped the mouths of lions,' and 'quenched the violence of fire.' And in several instances we discover a borrowing of the language of our book, unacknowledged indeed, but not the less marked. The expression, 'the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place,' occurring in a passage already noticed,[3] is derived from Dan. ix. 27, xii. 11; even the brief parenthetical appendage to it, 'whoso readeth let him understand,' also pointing, apparently, to expressions found in Dan. ix. 23, 25, and xii. 10. While in the words, 'There shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be,' occurring in the same chapter,[4] we have a manifest appropriation of Dan. xii. 1. In Matt. xxi. 44, the words, 'whoso shall fall on *this stone shall be broken*, but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder,' would seem to be borrowed from or suggested by the imagery employed in Dan. ii. 34, 35. Again in Matt. xviii. 21, 22, we have what at least appears like a similar transfer of the line of thought. In answer to the question of Peter, whether it is enough that he forgive his brother till seven times, Christ replies, 'I say not unto

[1] Rev. i. 7, 13.
[2] xi. 33, 34.
[3] Matt. xxiv. 15.
[4] Matt. xxiv. 21.

Digitized by Google

thee till seven times, but until seventy times seven.' So to Daniel praying for the accomplishment of the Jewish restoration, at the close of *seventy years* (Dan. ix. 2), the angel Gabriel replies, 'seventy weeks (i.e. not *seventy*, but *seventy times seven* years) are determined to thy people, and upon thy holy city' (Dan. ix. 24). In John v. 27, there has also been considered to be a reference to Dan. vii. 13, 14, as there is also in 1 Cor. vi. 2 to Dan. vii. 22.[1] While the language in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 'The Son of perdition who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God,' is a clear adaptation of Dan. vii. 25, viii. 25, and xi. 36. One other passage I may mention before closing this list, which might be further enlarged. In 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, we find the following:—'Of which salvation the prophets *have*

[1] The Rabbi Gaon, quoted by Phillips (Sermons on Messianic Texts, note to Sermon II.), says with reference to Daniel vii. 13, 'This is משיח צדקנו—Messiah our righteousness.' But perhaps this is best seen, in both these cases, by looking at the passages in juxtaposition, as below:—

(1) John v. 27: And hath *given Him authority* to execute judgment also, *because He is the Son of man.*	Dan. vi. 13, 14: One like the *Son of man* came in the clouds of heaven . . . and there was *given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom*, &c.

That the words in St. John refer to those in the book of Daniel was the opinion of Camero; and Grotius partly endorses it (see Bull's tract De Jes. Christ. divin. vi. § 18). Philippians ii. 9–11 is a reference to the same place. In the verses immediately following (John v. 28, 29) there is a further similar appropriation of the idea occurring in Daniel xii. 2, 3:—

(2) 1 Cor. vi. 2: Do ye not know that the *saints shall judge* the world?	Dan. vii. 22: . . . *judgment was given to the saints* of the Most High.

Digitized by Google

enquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace (that should come) unto you; *searching what or what manner* of time the spirit of Christ, *which was in them*, did signify, when it testified beforehand *the sufferings of Christ*, and the glory that should follow; unto whom it was revealed &c. . . . . which things *the angels desire to look into.*' Hengstenberg[1] here discovers a reference to Dan. xii. The prophet's 'searching diligently,' and the desire of the angels 'to look into' these future mysteries, certainly accord with what is there said of Daniel's enquiry (v. 8) and that of the angels (v. 6) as to 'how long' it should 'be to the end of these wonders.' The sufferings, too, of the 'Messiah' had been foretold in the vision of Daniel (ix. 26), and 'the glories which should follow' in chaps. ii. 44, vii. 26, 27, and xii. 2, 3. While it should also be observed that, if St. Peter does here really refer to the Book of Daniel, he expressly declares, that in the language there employed it was '*the spirit* within' the prophet '*did signify*,' and the matter of the predictions referred to that same spirit '*testified beforehand.*' In addition to the various passages here cited, I might point out several which occur, either in the way of reference or parallel, in the Apocalypse; but they are indeed too many to enumerate.[2]

[1] Authenticity of Daniel, p. 222.

[2] Instance the following as a specimen :—

Compare Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4,	with Rev.	xxii. 10.
viii. 17, x. 8,		xix. 10, xxii. 8.
vii. 16 &c., viii. 19 &c.		xvii. 1 &c., 7 &c., xxi. 9 &c.
vii. 7,		xiii. 1, xvii. 3, 12.

Indeed, the connection of the two books is so great that the one is almost essential to the other.

Digitized by Google

We have already discovered indications of an acquaintance with, and a recognition of, the authenticity of chaps. ii. iii. vi. vii. viii. ix. x. xi. xii., which is more than sufficient for my argument. To sum up this part of my subject: the inference I draw is simple, and, I think, unanswerable. I have heard of an eminent astronomer, who, by watching the motions of different heavenly bodies, and analysing the influences necessary to produce certain eccentricities which he detected, was enabled to trace up the lines of attraction to one common centre, and so discover a planet hitherto unknown. There are, in like manner, in the different passages which I have adduced, indications of an influence not traceable to any of the books the Bible contains, except the Book of Daniel. That is the centre of emanation, from which light is thrown upon them all, and to which they all therefore in return combine in pointing, as to an inspired original.[1] We discover the wake upon the waters, we follow it up, and it brings us to Daniel. These different pieces of evidence may indeed not be all of equal significance, but their testimony, when united, is very great. The sticks that singly may be snapped with ease, when collected in one make a fascine, strong enough to aid materially in the defence I have undertaken. For suppose the Bible did not now contain the book of Daniel,

[1] Compare the language of George Herbert 'On the Holy Scriptures:'—

'Oh, that I knew how all thy lights combine,
And the configurations of their glorie!
Seeing not only how each verse doth shine,
But all the constellations of the storie.

'This verse marks that, *and both do make a motion*
Unto a third, that ten leaves off doth lie,' &c.

Digitized by Google

but that a MS. of the latter, recently discovered, were placed in the hands of some person intimately acquainted with Scripture, that he might decide on its claim to be an inspired book. Even a first and hasty perusal would reveal to him enough to establish a strong *primâ facie* argument in its favour. He would at once see that it served to elucidate sundry passages of the acknowledged Scriptures, of which he had never before had any satisfactory explanation; that while Ezekiel in the Old Testament had spoken of a Daniel famed for his wisdom and goodness, and Christ in the New had quoted a Daniel a 'prophet,' in neither of which instances had he yet been able to discover the original alluded to, yet that *here* there was an account of one calling himself by that name, the circumstances related of him establishing beyond a doubt, if true, that he was both wise and good in an eminent degree, and that he was a prophet, as Christ had pronounced him; the very language, too, which the Saviour had quoted actually here occurring: that while there were expressions such as that of Matt. xxiv. 15, 'the abomination of desolation,' of which the purport was nowhere in his Scriptures fully explained, yet that in this book it was used in a connection, which at least helped him to see its meaning; or brief references to events, nowhere to his knowledge related, as in Heb. xi. 33, 34, where 'the mouths of lions are said to have been stopped, and 'the violence of fire' quenched, yet that here full details of such circumstances were given—details, too, so extraordinary in their nature as to warrant the reference to them among a series of professedly remarkable occurrences, as the catalogue there given by St. Paul undoubtedly is: that whereas doctrines such as those of the resurrection and of the angelic titles and ministries had a prominence

Digitized by Google

given them in the New Testament, as though on the sanction of the Old, no such sanction however being there found, yet that the book now placed in his hands contained a full recognition of them, and accorded singularly with the New Testament language on these topics. All this, I say, he might discover, even on a first and cursory perusal of the book. And would he not be naturally predisposed in favour of a book coming to hand with these credentials to recommend it, the demand, too, for some book of the kind being so transparent on the face of the Bible? Assuredly he would. Should he, however, be led on by these discoveries to give the book a further and more careful examination, and still find that it revealed throughout, even to the minutest circumstances, the harmony of truth, and all the signs of genuineness, his former predisposition to accept it, as being what it professed to be, would then almost amount to the certainty of conviction. The only kind of evidence still wanting would be the testimony of history, tracing the book up to the time and the individual to which it claims to belong.

We are now, then, at that stage in such an enquiry when we have come to acknowledge the truth of the claim of the book of Daniel to be an inspired portion of revelation, as at least *antecedently* probable, since we recognise in it the response to a demand of which there are several traces in different parts of Scripture; and while we know that without it revelation is incomplete, we see that really it serves to fill up a void, which is otherwise unaccountably vacant.

But we may go a step farther, and an important one, even than this. The case I have just been putting was the imaginary one, in which the book of Daniel was introduced, not as actually forming a part of the

Digitized by Google

recognised Scriptures, but only *claiming* to do so, though never yet, to our knowledge, having stood there. We, on the other hand, actually find it standing, as we know it to have stood for upwards of 2,000 years, among the books of Scripture[1] — a fact which is not to be lightly set aside. Our position, therefore, is not so free from bias as that of the person whose case I have been imagining. With us prejudice and association must both be primarily in the book's favour; and he who allows due weight to these considerations, and to all which I have adduced above, will find the natural reluctance to disturb a time-hallowed arrangement — regarding it as nothing more — greatly increased as he reflects on the effects that would follow. The chain cannot be broken with impunity. If the tree be uprooted from its native soil, the disturbance will not be confined to itself; many a sucker and satellite must follow. Now we have seen that there are numerous passages in Scripture as intimately connected with the Book of Daniel as the sucker is with the parent-tree. They must stand or fall together. Deny the book a place in the scheme of Divine revelation — as you do if you deny its genuineness, and so charge the writer with falsehood — and then we can stop short of nothing but an *expurgated Bible.* There must indeed be adduced reasons far stronger than anything yet alleged ere we can consent to admit the wedge that would lead to so wide-spread a ruin.

[1] The circumstance that the book has been placed by the Jews among the Hagiographa, and not, as we rank it, among the Prophets, though made much of by opponents, is really of no moment at all — at least as they would employ it. It rather, if anything, tends to confirm the book's genuineness. For a fuller discussion of this, see Part III. note 6, pp. 178–9.

Digitized by Google

PART II.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AFFORDED BY THE BOOK ITSELF.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART II.

In the preceding pages it has been my endeavour to show, that from the manner in which the Book of Daniel corresponds to and throws a light upon various passages of Scripture, the occurrence of which is not otherwise to be easily accounted for, there is no small *antecedent* probability in favour of the book being what it professes to be, viz. the production of an inspired writer, named Daniel, remarkable for his piety and wisdom, and living at the time of the Babylonish captivity. I now proceed to subject the book, chapter by chapter, to the searching scrutiny of a cross-examination; to try whether, having at least obtained for it fair play and a favourable hearing, it does itself, in its internal texture, the style and language in which it is couched, and the matter in which it deals, answer to the account which it thus at first sight gives of itself.

I enter upon this task avowedly with the intention of discovering truth wherever I can; as one who am firmly persuaded that 'the Scripture cannot be broken,' and prepared to believe that God and His own word are true, even though to hold such an opinion should necessitate my regarding, in consequence, every man as a liar. Yet, strong in this conviction, I have, on this very account, no inclination to support my case by

Digitized by Google

overstrained arguments; and I trust that in the following pages nothing will be found which does not become an honest writer, while all I ask in return is for thoughtful attention from everyone who may peruse them, be he friend or foe; for as they are the result of much patient and thoughtful attention, devoted to the language and various circumstances of the book of which they treat, —only to the patient enquirer does the mine yield up its treasures,—so I believe that their force will be more fully realised in proportion as attention accompanies their perusal; and that where I have failed to give it as clearly as it might be given, thought on the reader's part will supply the deficiency. Should it, however, appear in the case of any particular piece of evidence that I have assigned to it a greater importance than it merits, or deduced from it inferences which it will scarcely bear out, it is a peculiarity of the kind of proof which I am now about to enter upon (a peculiarity pointed out by the late Professor Blunt, a master in the art,[1] and which adds greatly to the value of such testimony) that the whole argument is composed of different and independent parts, any one of which, if deemed ill-chosen or unsound, may be withdrawn or passed over without material injury to the reasoning *as a whole*.

SECTION I.

The Book of Daniel opens with the following statement (i. 1): 'In the *third* year of the reign of Jehoiachim came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to

[1] To the value of evidence of this kind the editor of Horne's Introduction to Old Testament bears witness in the following words 'Such books as Blunt's Undesigned Coincidences cannot be too diligently perused.'—*Horne's Introd.*, Ayre's ed., p. 656, note 3.

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem, and besieged it.' Let us compare with this the contemporary accounts of Jeremiah. In chap. xxv. 1, he uses this expression: 'the *fourth* year of Jehoiachim, ... that was the *first* year of Nebuchadnezzar.' And again in chap. xlvi. 2: 'Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish, which Nebuchadnezzar smote in the *fourth* year of Jehoiachim.'

We have here two seeming discrepancies between these two authors: 1st, as to the particular year of Jehoiachim's reign, which answers to the first of Nebuchadnezzar; and 2, in the statement of the author of the Book of Daniel, that the expedition against Jerusalem was made in the *third* year of Jehoiachim; while according to Jeremiah the victory at Carchemish—which, from a collation of other passages,[1] we know to have *preceded* the siege of Jerusalem—did not take place till Jehoiachim's *fourth* year.

With neither of these points need I now deal, merely regarded as discrepancies; for as such they have been long ago satisfactorily reconciled;[2] but I purpose to go a step farther, and deduce from them an argument for the genuineness of the book before us.

The chronological order of events, as worked out by Prideaux, is as follows:—Late in the third year of Jehoiachim, Nebuchadnezzar is associated in the government of Babylon with his father Nabopolassar, whose increasing years render him unfit for the active duties of warfare. Encouraged by the late successes of Egypt, Palestine and all Syria have recently revolted; and Nebuchadnezzar at once proceeds, at the head of an army, to reduce them to subjection. He turns aside

[1] See Prideaux's Connection, vol. i. pp. 51-59. [2] Ibid.

Digitized by Google

however, from his direct route to attack Pharaoh at Carchemish, where he gains a complete victory, and retakes the place. This accomplished—and for its accomplishment we may allow a considerable time, when we take into account the distance to be traversed and the slow movement of large armies[1]—he resumes the expedition into Palestine. Having set out towards the close of the third year of Jehoiachim, it is probable that, so much being achieved on the way, the fourth year would be considerably advanced ere he found himself before Jerusalem—a supposition which finds confirmation both from other circumstances, detailed by Prideaux, and also in the fact that the Jews to this day observe a fast in the ninth month of their year (our November) in remembrance of the taking of the city.

Such is Prideaux's analysis and connection of these events. And here plainly the first discrepancy vanishes. The first year of Nebuchadnezzar, as associated with his father in the rule, corresponds to the close of the third and the greater part of the fourth years of Jehoiachim; and therefore the statements of Jeremiah and the writer of the Book of Daniel may be taken as equally true.[2] If anything, the account in Daniel shows a more accurate acquaintance with Babylonian dates, such as would be likely to distinguish a writer residing at Babylon.

[1] The journey of Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem occupied four months, and it was direct. Ezra vii. 9.

[2] Another mode of explaining this is, that the Babylonians did not reckon any but *complete* years in calculations of this kind. The first complete year, therefore, of Nebuchadnezzar, would be the fourth of Jehoiachim, in accordance with Jeremiah; while he was also king in the latter part of the third of Jehoiachim, as stated by the author of Daniel. Thus both accounts are again shown to be equally and minutely true.

Digitized by Google

To proceed to the second discrepancy—for this is where my argument mainly lies—I think it may be shown that not only does the difference between the two accounts not amount to a contradiction, but that it is what we might expect—at least what we must admit to be natural—if the circumstances of the two writers really were what they profess to have been.

For suppose, for the sake of argument, that the book called the Book of Daniel was really, as it purports to have been, written by him, i. e. by a person resident in Babylon where he wrote the accounts it contains, himself too in high office, with access to public and state documents, and in daily intercourse with those employed in the service of the court and government—what would be more natural for such an one, especially if he were writing after a lengthened residence there, than, when speaking of the expedition against Jerusalem, to mention the date of its leaving Babylon, the place at which he was writing, and the date which would be found in all the documents about him, rather than the date of the actual accomplishment of the purpose for which it had been undertaken; while one writing from Jerusalem, as Jeremiah did, might, and naturally would, dwell upon events happening more immediately in *his* own neighbourhood, might omit all mention of the date of the expedition's *starting*—for in that *he* would have no interest—and fasten upon events connected more closely with Jerusalem—as the defeat of Pharaoh would naturally appear to be, preceding, as it did, immediately the siege and capture of that city—might even speak of Nebuchadnezzar's reign having begun in the *fourth* year of Jehoiachim—that being the year in which he had first forced himself so unpleasantly upon the acquaintance of all Jews as a king—and the portion of the

Digitized by Google

preceding year, during which he had been in power, being too small to be worth taking into account, or perhaps even to have come to his knowledge. On the other hand, the writer in Babylon would naturally regard events from a Babylonish point of view, and so, mentioning first the period of the expedition's leaving Babylon, he might then, with the unconscious freedom of one who had no motive for disguise, who was relating circumstances which were well known, and who needed therefore to speak of them only in the briefest manner possible—*he* might, I say, so condense his description as to appear to bring close together events really separated by some months,[1] and yet in all this be free from the charge of untruthfulness. Now all this, which *might* have been the mode of procedure with one in the represented situation of Daniel the prophet—which would at least have been not unnatural in such an one —*is* actually what we find to have been the mode of procedure with the author of this book. He speaks of the expedition to Jerusalem, and of the siege of that place; yet he dates from the time of the expedition starting from Babylon; while in his brevity he draws the two events in appearance so closely together, that, had we only his account to go by, we might assign the latter circumstance to the same year as the former.

[1] This is not at all an uncommon occurrence in Scripture; especially are instances numerous in the Gospels, where a comparison of the different accounts continually shows that one writer has placed in close juxtaposition events really apart, omitting the intervening circumstances to be found elsewhere. I might specify—to take one instance out of many—the first verse of John vi., where the expression 'after these things' would, at first sight, imply an immediate succession to the events of the preceding chapter, whereas the other evangelists introduce a long series of circumstances as happening in the interim.

Digitized by Google

There is, however, I think, still a further trace of truthfulness discernible here. If the writer were (such as Daniel) a Jewish captive dwelling at Babylon, what more natural than that even in this his briefest allusion he should no more 'forget Jerusalem,' than his 'right hand forget her cunning?' and while as a resident, a naturalised resident at Babylon, his first point, as suggested by all the documents and associations about him, would be the expedition's *departure* from Babylon, what more natural than that his thoughts should next revert to that city which was the object of every Jew's warmest attachment and pride — the two subjects sure to be uppermost in his mind — and that in his brevity he should couple the two together, even at the risk of the appearance of inaccuracy, and to the exclusion of all intermediate events, which to him would be of less moment? Yet would such refinement in counterfeiting truth have ever occurred to an impostor? Had the writer of the Book of Daniel been inventing these accounts in a later age,[1] he would have made it his first object that his dates should tally exactly with those of the received accounts of contemporary writers. None but one who was writing from his own independent knowledge, as only Daniel, or one exactly in his position could do, would have ventured to make this apparent variation in dates without adding some reason for the difference. That he differs from another who wrote at the same time, though the difference is only in appearance, and differs without making any comment on it, by way of explanation, would imply either that he wrote without having seen Jeremiah's account, which

[1] This is the common allegation of all opponents to the book's genuineness. It has been the most recently repeated by Dr. Williams, Essays and Reviews, p. 76, 8vo. ed.

Digitized by Google

no one compiling or inventing the narrative at a later day would be so careless as to do, or else that, though knowing Jeremiah's dates, he considered his own as equally worthy of trust, which none could do except a person writing in Daniel's circumstances.

Nor, again, would any but one who wrote as actually influenced by the *feelings of a Jewish captive* have betrayed these minute touches of nature. In short, the language is here just what we might expect, even to the under current of unconscious feeling, if we allow Daniel to be himself the author; but it is also just what we should least look for, nay, what in some respects would have been sure to be avoided, if the book were written by anyone else — not Daniel — but desirous of being taken for him.

I have dwelt somewhat at length on this first piece of evidence, because it seems a remarkable circumstance that we should thus, in the very first verse of the book, encounter such traces of genuineness; so natural as to be just what we might expect when once they are pointed out, yet so incidentally thrown in that it were next to impossible they could be the result of design. Their early occurrence should indeed be regarded as an omen of good; for thus the lintel and doorpost, as it were, of the work bearing traces of 'the blood of sprinkling,' in the purity of truth, we are the more assured that the destroying angel of infidelity and scepticism will not be able to harm or detract from its inner details.

SECTION II.

It is an almost necessary consequence of the peculiar nature of the evidence of which I am now in search, that it should occur only occasionally—a kind of sub-

Digitized by Google

stratum, underlying, indeed, the whole, but only here and there *cropping out* above the surface; and that not unfrequently in trifles. This latter feature, however, really adds to its value; since when an author's *design* is to deceive, it is in trifles such as escape his notice that the truth generally oozes out. If, then, the Book of Daniel be a forgery, it is here that we might expect to detect some traces of it. But I think that, as we proceed, it will appear that even in these minor details the book will bear the test of sifting; that even omissions and inadvertencies—by which expressions I would not be understood as implying anything derogatory either to the sanctity or inspiration of Scripture—that even in these, the individual peculiarities of the writer, we discover the style and work of an honest man, bent on giving an unvarnished account of things as they actually were, and himself what he professes to be. Such evidence as this, I have said, from its very nature, can only be of occasional occurrence. In a book, more especially like the one under consideration, dealing as it does with matters of the greatest moment and of the most extraordinary character, it would be seldom that the writer's attention, even to his language, could be suffered to flag. When each sentence is so pregnant, almost every word must have been weighed. Still we cannot advance through the first chapter, without coming across instances such as I require for my purpose.

I do no more than point to the *veri-similitude* of many of the details of the narrative; as, for instance, the circumstance of the conqueror carrying away these Jewish princes or nobles to be employed in his service at home;[1] their being supported at the king's

[1] Compare Horace Od. i. xxix. 7, 8. Juvenal Sat. v. 60, 61. The choice, too, of the 'well-favoured' and unblemished for such

Digitized by Google

expense;[1] the care bestowed upon their education, and the nature of it;[2] the new name given to each on this change in their condition.[3] These are all circumstances capable of corroboration from other sources, sacred or profane; and thus they favour the veracity of the book, and therein the authorship of Daniel which the book asserts.[4] But inasmuch as it may be objected, and justly, that as customs well known they might be, and would be likely to be, introduced by *any* writer whose object it was to give his book the appearance of truthfulness, I do not press them into my service: *valeant quantum valent.*

purposes in one well known to have been usual; and mentioned by Ricault (State of the Ottoman Empire) as prevailing equally in modern times.

[1] Ctesias says as many as 15,000 were thus maintained; Jer. lii. 33, 34, mentions that king Jehoiachin was thus supported. Comp. Heeren, vol. i. p. 493.

[2] Compare Plato, Alcibiades, i. 121, 122, where an account is given of the education of Persian youths. See also the account in Xenophon's Cyropæd. lib. i. c. ii.

[3] Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 34, where the name of Eliakim is said to have been turned to Jehoiakim; in xxiv. 17, Mattaniah becomes Zedekiah. From Ezra i. 9, 11, and ii. 2, it would appear that Zerubbabel was also named Sheshbazzar: a custom which has its counterpart in the New Testament in the cases of Simon Peter, Matthew, and Paul, as in the Old Testament it had been anticipated in the case of Joseph in Egypt. See Gen. xli. 45.

[4] I here take it for granted that this claim is asserted on behalf of the whole book; for though nothing is expressly said to that effect in the early part of the book, yet the unity of the book is apparent, both in its general character—the political element prevailing throughout, and corresponding so well with the position of its reputed author—and in sundry parallelisms of style and expression, incidentally occurring in different parts, so as to stitch, as it were, the whole together as one work. Nor, indeed, is its unity any longer questioned. See § xlii. note 1, p. 129, and the summary of Part II. pp. 162–4.

Digitized by Google

I now proceed to remark on the historical use of the third person in the writer's account of what happened to Daniel. I am aware that this is a practice common to several writers, as for instance to St. John, Thucydides, Xenophon, and others,[1] and therefore that it may be objected that no great stress can be laid upon it here. While, however, I admit that it would be worthless as evidence that Daniel was *not* the author, this objection, I conceive, entirely vanishes when I employ it for the more novel purpose of confirming the reverse. My argument is this: An impostor wishing to personate Daniel—as the author of this book, *if* he be not Daniel, certainly does—would have been almost certain to employ the first person; and though, when carried along by his subject, he might subsequently, through inadvertency, have dropped into the use of the third—the forgery thus betraying itself; yet at least in the early part of the book, he would have been especially careful to do everything which might tend to identify him with Daniel in the minds of his readers. Yet this is exactly the reverse of what we find in the book itself; the writer begins with the use of the third person, and only at a later stage acknowledges his identity. Now this use of the third person in the historic part of the book, and of the first person in the prophetic, corresponds to St. John's different modes of writing in his Gospel, and in

[1] St. John never once mentions himself by name in his gospel. Compare also Matt. ix. 9; Is. ii. 1, vii. 3, xx. 2, xiii. 1; Ezek. i. 3; and Xenophon's Anab. book iii. ch. i. § 4; book v. ch. i. § 5, &c. Thucydides, iv. 104, uses the third person; in v. 26, both first and third; in ii. 48, the first. This variation in the use of the first and third persons is also found in the Persian inscriptions recently brought to light. See Rawlinson's Memoir on the Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions, vol. i. pp. 279, 286, 287, 292, 293, 324, &c.

Digitized by Google

the Apocalypse, and is accounted for thus, that in history the person of the narrator is necessarily thrown into the background, whereas in prophecies, which are the effect of revelations made to himself personally, he is compelled to assume a greater prominence;[1] yet this would scarcely have been likely to occur to an impostor. So that we have here what is quite in keeping with the circumstances of the book's author, if he be Daniel, but unnatural in any one else.

SECTION III.

Another point on which I may briefly touch is the mention, in ch. i. ver. 8, of Daniel's resolve not to defile himself with the royal fare. We should not overlook the dangerous nature of such a proceeding, for the defiance of the royal pleasure, in those times of absolute despotism, even in lesser matters than this, might have cost a man his life. Daniel, we should therefore infer, must have had some weighty reasons for adopting such a course; and this is confirmed by the pertinacity with which he clings to his determination, and the fact that his three companions join him in it. The common explanation, that such food had been previously dedicated to the national gods is probably the true one; yet, be it observed, the writer of the book says not one word about any reason, beyond the simple statement that it was to avoid defilement. Now on this we may argue as follows:—An impostor writing at a later date, and inventing his accounts, would have omitted this subject altogether, or else have given the reasons which actuated

[1] See Auberlen on Daniel and the Apocalypse, p. 5, Engl. transl.; and Hengstenberg on Daniel, p. 185, Engl. transl.

Digitized by Google

Daniel. He would have known how unlikely it would appear that such danger should have been incurred unless for some good reason; and if he wished his narrative to be credited, he would have taken care to show that under the circumstances Daniel did, in this matter, what it was probable a good man would do, by giving the reasons for his conduct. Here, then, is the difference between what would have been necessary for such an author to do, and what might be done by Daniel himself. The former would be writing a book which had to win its way on its own merits; at a time, too, when the history of the age of which it professed to speak would be unknown to many, and therefore when it would only gain credence, so far as its accounts could be substantiated, or at least looked probable. If, on the other hand, Daniel were the author, then he would be relating what was a matter of notoriety, or at least within the cognisance and recollection of many; and resting on the strong basis of his own character for the reception of his narrative by others, who might not be acquainted with the events, HE would very probably state facts of this kind, especially when writing concisely (and such is undeniably the character of this prefatory chapter), without giving a detailed history of their causes. Here, therefore, even in the *incompleteness* of the account I discover signs of that confidence which arises from the consciousness of having the truth along with us. This resolve of Daniel is evidently mentioned only as a necessary preface to the account of the miraculous circumstances to which it afterwards led: as such it was only requisite that a bare mention of it should be made, without entering into the reasons for it. But Daniel, or one exactly in his position, would be the only person who could *afford* to notice it thus briefly, for

Digitized by Google

the reasons assigned above. I think, therefore, that we are justified in taking upon ourselves to assert, that the account of this resolve of Daniel would never have appeared as a part of the Book of Daniel, at least in the form in which we there find it, unless Daniel himself were the author. There is more evidence of this nature to be found in the narrative, and the form in which it is couched in the verses immediately following; but let this suffice, since their discussion would only involve a repetition of much that has been said.

SECTION IV.

I pass on to the last verse of the chapter. The introduction of this verse here seems inexplicable, except on the supposition of the book's genuineness. It has been regarded by some as a contradiction of chap. x. 1;[1] and therefore adduced as an argument against the book's veracity. Any such contradiction however is entirely chimerical; the statement here that Daniel lived to the time of Cyrus by no means implying that he lived no longer. Still I argue that an impostor would have carefully abstained from throwing such difficulties, though only superficial, in the way of his book's reception. Besides, it would be difficult to conceive with what object he would introduce, in so abrupt and disconnected a manner, an observation, only informing us of what, he knew, the sequel of his narrative would reveal in its proper place; at least an object, the advantage of which would not be more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages flowing from the introduction of the

[1] See Horne's Introduction, Ayre's edition, p. 850.

Digitized by Google

expression. But allow the book to have been written by Daniel himself, and then all can be made clear. I conceive that this, the first chapter of the book, is designed to be a preface or introduction to the rest, added by the prophet at a late period in his life; either the whole of it written together at the close of the captivity—'the first year of king Cyrus'—or the first twenty verses written at some time during that period of seventy years (possibly simultaneously with his resumption of the Hebrew language in chap. viii.) and this last verse added subsequently.[1] And while it would be almost objectless with any other writer, yet as written by him, it would be peculiarly significant, and in keeping with one leading design of the book. Daniel, be it observed, seems to write to show that God, even in degradation and exile, does not forget his people;[2] a lesson taught in the first six chapters of his book by striking events of history, and in the six following proclaimed by prophecy. By the addition, then, of this verse—subjoined no doubt under the warmest sense of gratitude to God for the accomplishment of that national restoration which had been the subject of his heart's earnest solicitude and prayers (see ix. 2, 3, 4, &c.), Daniel would seem to be reminding his readers, most forcibly, how the love of God continues to abide with his servants, to carry them through the deepest afflictions, and after the longest periods of trial to reward them at last. He cannot revert to the incidents of his early youth, and the circumstances

[1] Similar additions to the original text of Scripture documents occur elsewhere; as in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, the register of priests and Levites inserted in ch. xii. of Nehemiah, &c.

[2] See an article on Daniel by Hävernick, in Kitto's Biblical Encyclopædia.

Digitized by Google

under which he was brought to Babylon, without at once directing his own thoughts and the thoughts of his readers too—overleaping the gloomy interval—to the glorious hour of emancipation. He cannot wait for the gradual development of the narrative to tell the story of his heart's desire; but even at this early stage—indeed the very first opportunity which presents itself—having told how it had been God's good pleasure to bring him and his countrymen into the land of captivity, he adds, in the overflowing fulness of his gratitude—even though it be out of place to do so—how the divine goodness had also spared him to survive that period of national depression. Nor, as we ought to remember, was this fact of his survival a matter of an ordinary nature. Daniel, not only in the character of his writings, but in some respects in his personal history, seems to occupy a place in the Old Testament analogous to that of St. John in the New. Was St. John 'the disciple whom Jesus loved?' Daniel, too, is expressly called by an angel 'greatly beloved' (x. 11, 19). As St John was preserved to a great age that he might 'tarry' (John, xxi. 23) till his Lord *came* in the destruction of Jerusalem; the prophet too was spared to an age beyond that of man, that, at the close of a similar period of seventy years, he might behold the Lord visit his people, by redeeming them from the Babylonish captivity. Signally, therefore, was the hand of the Lord upon his servant, and most natural would it be (though surely beyond the possibility of a counterfeit's imitation) for that servant to be thus telling of His goodness, even to the breaking through the continuity of his narrative.

Digitized by Google

SECTION V.

Chapter ii. opens with what, at first sight, seems a glaring discrepancy. The events recorded here are plainly subsequent to the three years during which Daniel was receiving his Chaldæan[1] education; occurring therefore rather more than *three* years after the capture of Jerusalem, and in the *fourth* year after the departure of Nebuchadnezzar from Babylon on that expedition.[2] If, then, Nebuchadnezzar was at that time 'king,' as he is called by the writer of this book in chap. i. 1, how is it that now, though four years have elapsed, he has only reached the *second* year of his reign, as stated in verse 1 of this chapter? This has been satisfactorily explained by the help of information from other and independent sources.[3] It appears that in the former

[1] See ch. i. 5, 18. [2] See above, § i.

[3] This explanation comes from different passages. Berosus, a priest of Bel, living in the time of Antiochus II., states, in a quotation preserved by Josephus (cont. Ap. i. 20) that Nebuchadnezzar reigned 43 years. This is confirmed by Polyhistor (ap. Euseb. Chron. i. 5, § 5, p. 21); and by Ptolemy (in Mag. Syntax, v. 14). See also Rawlinson (Bamp. Lect. v. note 17). Berosus, however, in another passage quoted by Josephus (J. A. x. 11, 1), states that Nebuchadnezzar was entrusted with the command of the army by his father, some months, evidently, before his death. That, probably, as in the case of Belshazzar and Nabonadius (see below, § xxvii.), would involve a participation in the rule. From a comparison of 2 Kings xxiv. 12 with xxv. 27, we get the scriptural computation of his reign at 45 years; which is thus to be reconciled with the canon of Ptolemy, placing his reign two years later — the Jewish account evidently including the period of joint rule with his father, while the canon only speaks of his rightful reign. By another mode of interpretation adopted by Rawlinson (Bamp. Lect. v. note 19), the Jewish computation corresponds exactly with the accounts here quoted. The eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar is the first of

Digitized by Google

case (i. 1), Nebuchadnezzar was king in conjunction with his father; his own accession to the *independent* rule took place two years later, on his father's demise; and therefore the date given here (ii. 1), is no less correct than the former, being reckoned from this later period, though at first sight the two seem entirely at variance. But it is with the seeming discrepancy itself, rather than with its explanation, that I am now concerned; and I argue, as I have argued before, that this expression in chap. ii. 1 would never have been admitted into the book, differing as it does apparently from the former—the passages too coming so close to each other as to challenge attention—if the author had been an impostor. But suppose the book the production of Daniel, and all is plain. As residing, and now in a great measure naturalised (for that would be the effect of his education) at Babylon, he would be likely to give his dates in Babylonish style. He was correct in calling Nebuchadnezzar 'king' in the first instance, for what else could he have called him? and since four years after, by Babylonish reckoning, Nebuchadnezzar's proper reign had only reached its second year, he is no less correct in this latter instance, as well as using the language most suited to the position he professes to occupy. Writing, too, with a thorough knowledge of these events, as he must have done if his representations

Jehoiachin's captivity (2 Kings xxiv. 12); therefore, Nebuchadnezzar's reign began seven full years earlier; and since the thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxv. 27) is the first of Evil-Merodach, therefore the thirtieth would be the last of Nebuchadnezzar. Putting the two periods together we have 36 + 7 = 43. This, however, supposing it to be the reckoning intended by the sacred writer, does not at all invalidate or interfere with my argument regarding Daniel.

Digitized by Google

are true, and familiar with the public documents that recorded them, the appearance of inconsistency might never occur to him; especially if, as seems likely, he added the first chapter long after the second had been written. It is then most easy to understand how Daniel might write thus; but almost inconceivable that any one else would.

A further thought suggests itself in connection with this, and others of the dates in this book, which tends to the same conclusion. While Ezekiel dates by the years of the captivity,[1] everything in this book of Daniel is dated by the years of the respective reigns in which the events occur. Yet does not this accord exactly with the different circumstances of the two writers, if their own representations be true. The one living among his exiled countrymen, with no *status* in the land of their exile, dates, as we might expect him to do, by the years of that exile; while the other, in high office in the land, dates as we might expect anyone familiar with the customs and records of the land. Yet surely this is too trifling a matter to be the effect of design, and therefore only explicable as the result and evidence of truth.

SECTION VI.

With the speech of the Chaldæans beginning in the fourth verse of chap. ii. the language of the original also changes from Hebrew, to what, in the text, is

[1] Except in one instance, ch. i. 1. But if this, as seems likely, is a date after the Babylonish fashion, there is surely nothing unnatural about it, when we remember that the writer is a captive in Babylon. He dates, however, decidedly by the years of the captivity in the following passages:—ch. viii. 1; xx. 1; xxix. 1; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xl. 1.

Digitized by Google

termed 'Syriac,'[1] but now is more generally known as a dialect of the Aramaic vernacular. The present therefore is a favourable opportunity for the discussion of this subject, so far at least as it furnishes us with any arguments of the kind we are now seeking; for a *full* examination of the question of the two languages, in all its bearings, does not fall within the scope of the present undertaking, and to do it justice would be beyond the capabilities of the writer.

My first point, then, is this: That the use of the two languages in the Book of Daniel, especially in the particular *manner* in which they are employed, seems incompatible with any supposition except that of the book's genuineness. This, I conceive, appears from the following considerations. In the whole range of the Old Testament there are only four instances where this Aramaic language is employed; and two of these four are limited, in the one case[2] to a couple of words, the introduction of which anyone, on a reference to the passage, will see to be quite natural; in the other,[3] to a single verse, the appropriateness of which is evident, in that it supplied the Jew, not only with the sentiment, but with the very language, which he might address to the heathen with whom the captivity would bring him in contact. In the two remaining instances,[4] the reason lies on the surface of the passages themselves; for they contain copies of decrees made by the Babylonish monarch, or the account of communications which passed between him and the people of Samaria or of Jerusalem;

[1] The Hebrew is resumed with chap. viii., and continued to the end of the book.

[2] Gen. xxxi. 47. [3] Jer. x. 11.

[4] Ezra iv. 8—vi. 18; vii. 12—26.

Digitized by Google

and therefore it is likely they were taken, almost word for word, from the public records of Babylon.[1] Bearing then this in mind, it seems most improbable that an impostor wishing his book to pass as the production of an inspired Jewish prophet, would have written so large a portion of it in a foreign tongue, of which so little was to be found in the acknowledged Scriptures; but if he did venture to do so, he would most certainly only do it *with a design.* The question, then, now arises—is there any design apparent; a design, be it observed, consistent with the desire that his book should possess the appearance of truth, and which aimed (as it must have done) at results sufficiently advantageous to induce him to depart so far from established precedent, when adherence to precedent would, in his case, have been considerably in his favour? Now it has been said by some,[2] that the use of these two languages may fairly be considered as fixing the date of the book to the time of the captivity. It might be imagined, then, that such an idea would also occur to an impostor writing the book at a later date, and that accordingly (supposing the book to be the production of such an one), he used the two languages to give it the appearance of having been written at that time; which would seem the more likely, when we remember that *he* would have the precedent of Ezra. I admit the possibility of such an idea occurring to such an one; reserving however to myself the subsequent

[1] That such records were kept is evident from Esther ii. 23; vi. 1; ix. 32; x. 2; Ezra iv. 15; v. 17; vi. 1. In the two last there is a reference to the office or chamber in which these rolls were kept. And such a chamber was found by Layard in the ruins of Kouyunjik, with the remains of state papers still perceptible, and a signet in good preservation. Layard, Bab. and Nin. vol. i. p. 158-9.

[2] Rawlinson, Bamp. Lect. v. p. 125.

Digitized by Google

enquiry, whether, even if that were his object, he would or *could* have written such Aramaic as we have here. I proceed now to remark on the *manner* in which the Aramaic is employed, which, I conceive, is certainly not what we should expect were such an one the author. His only precedent, as I have said, at all to the point would be Ezra; and had he, with a view to *fathering* the book on the time of the captivity, resolved to introduce Aramaic, in imitation of Ezra, he would have carefully followed the precedent thus provided. Yet, while in Ezra the Aramaic passages are confined to Babylonish decrees, or what might naturally be found in Babylonish records, it is not so with the Aramaic in the book under consideration. Plainly, then, the writer of the Book of Daniel was not imitating Ezra, or he would have been careful to copy him in this important particular, the very feature, indeed, which mainly serves to invest the passages of Ezra with the appearance of truth.

We are thus driven to look for some other reason than this, for without reason the Aramaic would most certainly not have been employed. Now, no completely satisfactory reason has ever yet been suggested; unless, indeed, we admit the genuineness of the book, when the position and circumstances of Daniel are themselves sufficient to render the use of the two languages most natural; but even then there are no positive traces of any design with which they are employed.

In support of what I say, let us briefly analyse the book's contents. After the introductory first chapter, those following, to the close of the sixth, are occupied with matters of a public nature, while the last six belong rather to the private history of Daniel himself. The use of the Aramaic, then, in chapters ii.—vi. seems natural enough; the subject matter of those chapters

Digitized by Google

being such as would most probably be entered in the public records of the country, and copied from those records by the writer; but on coming to the seventh chapter, we find the same language continued, though the matter is totally different, being there entirely of a private nature. Now, surely, had the writer written those chapters ii.–vi. in Aramaic *because* he copied from public records, or wished to appear to have done so, the Aramaic would have been discontinued after the sixth chapter, since what follows is not of a nature to be found in the public documents of any country, much less of a heathen one.

Again all the circumstances belonging to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar (except the introductory chapter, probably added long after), are related in Aramaic;[1] those belonging to the reigns of Belshazzar,[2] and Darius,[3] partly in Aramaic and partly in Hebrew. And while it is clear from ch. vi. 28, that at least part of that chapter, though in Aramaic, was not written till the reign of Cyrus, and further not even quite at the beginning of that, yet the chapters[4] which record events belonging to his (Cyrus's) reign, are written entirely in Hebrew.

To go a step further. In chapters vi. ix. xi. we have accounts of, or allusions to events that occurred in the reign of Darius. Those in the sixth chapter are of a public nature, and related in the vernacular of the country; the contents of chapters ix. and xi. are rather connected with the private history of Daniel himself, and are recorded in his own mother tongue. Are we tempted, then, to infer that we have here discovered a

[1] Ch. ii.—iv.
[2] Ch. v. vii. viii.
[3] Ch. vi. ix.
[4] Ch. x. xi. xii.

Digitized by Google

rule,—that public events are related in the language of the country, and the private incidents of Daniel's life given, as he might naturally be expected to give them, in his own native language? It is indeed likely that an impostor might have so arranged it. But compare after this, chapters vii. and viii., and though we find the events recorded in each of the same private nature (however wide-spread their purport as prophecies), yet ch. vii. is in Aramaic, ch. viii. in Hebrew.

Nor, lastly, can we accept as satisfactory the suggestion, originating I believe with Lowth, and adopted by others since, that those parts of the book, 'in which the Babylonian empire was concerned were writ in *their* language,' since there are prophecies having a direct and acknowledged bearing on that empire, which occur in later chapters, after the writer has resumed his Hebrew.[1] Now in all this, I conceive that there is the reverse of any design discoverable in the employment of the Aramaic in this book;[2] nay, that there is so total an absence of all profession of method or plan about it, as no impostor anxious about the appearance of his book would have been guilty of; since any advantage like to be gained by the use of the two languages, as serving to fix the book's date to the time of the captivity, he would at once have seen would be more than counterbalanced by the incongruities above pointed out; and the writer who had the

[1] See ch. viii. 3-7; x. 13-20; xi. 2-4, &c.

[2] The evident division of the book into the historic and prophetic has nothing to do with the question of the language employed. There is, undoubtedly, design in the contents of the book and their arrangement; but what I am seeking to show is that there is none in the use of these two languages—certainly none such as would have occurred to an impostor, necessarily careful about the form his book was to take, and apparently none even such as might occur to Daniel.

Digitized by Google

cunning to scheme the one piece of deception, would have been too astute to admit, what would appear to him, blunders so great as to more than undo the good he had sought to do himself.[1]

But ascribe the authorship of the book to Daniel the prophet, and then all is at least comprehensible. Thoroughly trained in the learning of Babylon, in addition to a previous superior education in his native land,[2] he is equally at home, so to speak, in writing the language of either country; and he employs them both, the more naturally, because without design—employs them, we may fairly assume, just as circumstances incline him. At ch. ii. 4 he no doubt begins to quote

[1] Auberlen (Daniel and the Apocalypse, pp. 29, 30) thinks the two languages a part of the design of the book, and connected with the different nature of the subject-matter of the two parts; that where we find the writer dealing with the history of the powers of the world, there he uses the language of the worldly power in which he lived; while in the history of what awaited the people of God, their own language was the medium employed. If, however, this be so, it in nowise invalidates my argument; as I still think such a plan would not recommend itself to an impostor by advantages to be derived from it greater than the disadvantages necessarily attending a departure from all established usage among the acknowledged prophets. Had such an one, however, adopted such a plan, he would in some way or other have revealed his reasons; for that he should undertake a task of such difficulty (for most difficult it would be, as we shall presently see), with a fixed design of this kind, and yet studiously conceal the design which alone gave a value and significance to the form adopted, is inconceivable. This solution, however, of Auberlen's, though ingenious, is at the best only conjectural, and difficult to make out—a plan rather, I think, imparted to the work long after completion, than the design on which the work was itself originally moulded.

[2] This is implied in ch. i. 4, where it is said that they only were to be selected, who, among other recommendations, were 'skilful in all wisdom, cunning in knowledge, and understanding science.'

Digitized by Google

from public records; and on giving a speech made originally in the vernacular, and giving it as it was originally spoken, he falls, almost as it were unconsciously, on this the first opportunity for so doing, into that language in which the matter in hand was already recorded, and which he knows is now unobjectionable, as being by this time as well understood by his countrymen as their own Hebrew—perhaps more so.[1] Having then once begun to use this language he continues to do so without hesitation, even where he ceases to record matters of a public nature (as in ch. vii.); but suddenly in ch. viii. he resumes the use of Hebrew. Possibly it was at this period that he prefixed the prefatory chap. i. to the accounts already given, and so, with the mention of his early years, returned to the language of his youth.

I know not whether there is any significance, as connected with this resumption of his native language, in the fact, mentioned in verse 2 (ch. viii.) that he was *not now at Babylon*, but at least, it looks like a coin-

[1] Kimchi, Buxtorf, and Walton, think that the Jews, as a people, lost all knowledge of Hebrew during the captivity; on the other hand, this is doubted by others, as Pfeiffer and Löscher. It is found on coins of the times of the Maccabees, but that proves nothing, since such a use of it might be traditional. Corrupt Aramaic became the only writing medium fully a century before Christ, as it had been the only language spoken for some time before; but though the change would naturally *begin* during the captivity, it would require a considerable lapse of time to complete. The knowledge of Welsh and Gaelic has long been discouraged in the British Isles, but it survives still. (See Kitto, Biblical Encyclop. s. v. 'Hebrew.') From Neh. viii. 4, 8, it would seem that even then it had become necessary to have the Hebrew of the Scriptures explained to the people; but, as this passage is sometimes taken to mean nothing more than that Ezra delivered the law to others and they to the multitude, though all in the same language, we cannot build anything decisive upon it.

Digitized by Google

cidence, that all the previous chapters written in Aramaic detail events which appear to have happened at Babylon; as though while in the immediate vicinity of the court, and where Babylonian associations were the strongest, he employed the Babylonian language, as that which he had adopted along with his life there, and in which the miraculous circumstances would be recorded as they stood in the public records; yet when removed from this centre of attraction, and moreover, as seems probable, occupying only an inferior post[1] in the king's service, with the change of place and association he falls back upon his own native speech; which, once resumed, he continues to the end of the book.

There seems, however, internal evidence that the different parts of this book were not all written in the order in which they now stand. The close of the sixth chapter, to which I have before alluded, shows that at least that part of the chapter was written at a later date than the seventh. Probably the original of ch. vi., i.e. the public records, though themselves written at the time of the events, or soon after (and most probably by Daniel), were not copied into the exact form which they assume in this book till the reign of Cyrus, when this verse (28) was added. Whereas the nature of the subject-matter of ch. vii. would require that it should be immediately committed to writing. The easiest, and indeed the only apparent solution of all these difficulties would seem to be that the different episodes and narratives which comprise the whole book were, in the case of the *historic* portions, copied, in the case of the

[1] On comparing viii. 27 with v. 11, it appears that though Daniel was at this time doing 'the king's business,' he was not known to Belshazzar; hence it is reasonable to infer that his post was not a prominent one.

Digitized by Google

prophetic portions, composed or written, at different periods of Daniel's life, and in whichever language circumstances of only a temporary or local importance led him to employ; and that subsequently, towards the close of his life, he arranged them in the order in which they now stand,[1] that order being evidently artificial. This were perfectly natural in Daniel; both the absence of all method as regards the language employed and the evident design in the arrangement of the book into its two divisions, the historic and prophetic: but at least the former would be the very course which anyone—not Daniel himself, but one wishing his book to pass as the production of Daniel—would have been sure to avoid. But allowing that the book is genuine, we then see how the wisdom of God, by leading Daniel thus to depart from all precedent,—for in that case the book of Ezra did not yet exist to form a precedent,—thus provided additional facilities for the preservation of the book. Not merely did its preservation now depend on the children of the captivity, but the Assyrians themselves, so to speak, had a stake in it. It was jointly embedded in the languages of the two nations; and thus both were engaged to teach posterity, by these records, how marvellously God is with His true people, even though exiled and outcast.

[1] It does not, indeed, impugn the genuineness of the book, if we allow, as Mr. Westcott (Smith's Dict. of the Bible, art. 'Book of Daniel,' § 11) seems inclined to do, that the whole may not have been united into one book until the time of Ezra, who—or the commission of which he was a member—brought together what Daniel had written. Such a concession, however, seems unnecessary: the book bears about it such indications of completeness that I think, saving the one important exception mentioned in § l., we have in it the whole series of documents as Daniel himself strung them together. For the manner in which they are thus closely connected in one, see §§ xl. and xlii.

Digitized by Google

Thus far I have been reasoning from the *manner* in which the two languages appear to be employed in this book. I now proceed to deduce evidence from the particular *form* or *texture* the languages themselves here assume.

This, again, is a division of the subject into which the limits of a work like the present will not allow us to enter at any length. I shall therefore content myself with the results of other men's labours; men, indeed, far more competent than myself for such investigations, and whose evidence will not be of less value if what they have said for a different purpose I employ to establish my own.

The language then of this book, both Hebrew and Aramaic, has been objected to as corrupt;[1] and hence it is argued that the book must have been written at a later date than the age of Daniel. From the time of Collins,[2] with whom such objections originated, down to their latest repetition by one of the writers of the 'Essays and Reviews,'[3] these assertions have been satisfactorily answered and refuted; and I think I shall make it appear, that in proportion as philology advances their unsoundness becomes the more transparent.

Let us take the Hebrew first. The glacial theory has its analogy in literature, and languages too, like glaciers, have their rate of progress; from the moment of their birth in the throes of chaotic Babel, to the period of their absorption by some sister tongue or

[1] By De Wette (Einleit. § 235, b. 4, p. 385); at greater length by Bertholdt, p. 24 *et seq.*; Bleek, Kirms, and others, are of the same opinion.

[2] Quoted by Chandler, in his Vindication of Daniel, obj. viii.

[3] P. 76, 8vo. ed.

Digitized by Google

tongues. And though in a nation characterised, as the Jewish was, by a spirit of isolation, that rate would be generally so slow as to be imperceptible, yet there were periods, too, when it would be accelerated by external pressure. Such a period was that of the Babylonish captivity. If therefore this book were written at that time, we should expect it to disclose traces of the change we know from other sources to have been then going on.[1]

Now let us see how far the actual character of the Hebrew corresponds to this. The learned writer[2] of the article on 'the Book of Daniel,' in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' states that the Hebrew 'belongs to an era of *transition*,' though it is still recognised as bearing 'the closest affinity to that of Ezekiel and Habakkuk.' Hävernick[3] considers it not unlike that of Ezekiel, though less impure and corrupt.[4] The Hebrew, then, according to this account, is just what we might expect in a book written at the time of the captivity. Its correspondence with the language of Ezekiel and Habakkuk, who wrote nearest to the age of Daniel, points to this conclusion; while the additional fact that, if they differ at all, there is less of impurity

[1] Even in Jeremiah—in whom, from the fact of his never having gone into Babylon, we should not expect it to be so marked—it is discoverable that 'his language came under the influence acting on all writers of his times . . . a time when the purity of the Hebrew was giving way under continual contact with other kindred dialects.' —Smith's Dictionary of Bible, s. v. 'Jeremiah.'

[2] B. F. Westcott.

[3] Kitto's Biblical Encyclopædia, art. 'Daniel.'

[4] Stuart quotes the opinion of Gesenius (Geschich. Heb. Sprach., p. 35), that the diction of Daniel is decidedly purer than that of Ezekiel; in which opinion he affirms that he himself 'entirely coincides.' Stuart's Comm. on Daniel, p. 465.

Digitized by Google

and corruption perceptible in this book than in that of Ezekiel, would agree firstly to the superior education enjoyed by Daniel,[1] and secondly with the difference in the respective positions occupied by him and Ezekiel; the one, so far as we know, residing mainly at Babylon, and thrown little, if at all, into contact with the lower orders of the Jewish captives; the other most probably living among them, and in daily intercourse with them, as a prophet and priest. And if, as is stated by Doctor Chandler,[2] the incorrectness of the Hebrew, in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Malachi is greater than that discoverable in the book of Daniel, our supposition is further confirmed; for those books having been written,[3] with the exception of Esther, and perhaps Malachi, at no great interval after the captivity, we have strong grounds for assuming that the Book of Daniel, as being less corrupt, must have preceded them; i.e. it must have been written, either during, or close upon that period; and since, in that case, the difficulty of forgery would be immeasurably increased, the genuineness of the book becomes next to certain.

[1] Possibly, too, there may have been originally a considerable difference in the rank and social position of the two. Daniel was of high, if not princely birth (conf. Dan. i. 3)—Josephus says of the seed of Zedekiah (J. A. x. 10); while Ezekiel was the son of a priest of the name of Buzi, and a tradition—on which, however, no great stress can be laid—even makes him the servant of Jeremiah. Greg. Naz., Or. xlvii.

[2] Vindication of Daniel, arg. ii.

[3] I assume that the books of Chronicles were, in the main, the production, or at least the compilation, of Ezra; for that has been 'the constant tradition of the Jews,' and the one 'followed by the great mass of Christian commentators.' Smith's Dictionary of Bible, art. 'Chronicles.'

Digitized by Google

So far for the Hebrew; and now of the Chaldee. Collins,[1] and those who take their cue from him, assert that it is of a later date than the time of the captivity. In the particular case of Collins, as Dr. Chandler shows, the assertion is based, either upon a misapprehension or a misrepresentation of the language of Prideaux;[2] and thus this blind guide has led others into the ditch, after his own example, down to the present day. But not only would it be impossible for any such assertion to be established, from the very paucity of Aramaic documents whereby to form a judgement; but among scholars, the majority seems to preponderate considerably in favour of the opposite opinion. Hävernick[3] says the Chaldean 'resembles mostly the Chaldean pieces of Ezra, but differs greatly from the later Targums.' The writer on 'the Book of Daniel,' in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, says, 'the Aramaic, *like that of* Ezra, is of an earlier form than any other Chaldaic document.' This is allowed by Maurer,[4] from whom the admission is valuable, as that of an enemy, since he is undoubtedly unfavourable to the authenticity of the book. Delitzsch[5] considers that the radical correspondence of the Aramean with that of Jeremiah and Ezra proves that they were of the same date, as Hengstenberg[6] and Davidson[7] adduce a number of examples which show that the Chaldee of Daniel agrees with that of Ezra, and that

[1] See Chandler's Vindication of Daniel, obj. viii.

[2] Prideaux's Connection, vol. ii. p. 501, ed. 1845.

[3] Kitto's Biblical Encyclopædia, art. 'Daniel.'

[4] Maurer's Comm. on Daniel, p. 87.

[5] In his article on Daniel, in Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie für Theologie.

[6] Beiträge, i. 303 ff.

[7] In his edition of Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 919.

Digitized by Google

both differ from that of the Targums. The same line is taken by Keil.[1] Now here we have an array of testimony not lightly to be set aside; least of all by the flippant[2] assertions with which objectors have strangely contented themselves. And until something more reasonable shall be alleged against us than has yet been produced, we are, I think, fully justified in assigning the Chaldee of Daniel to the same age, or nearly so, as that of Ezra. But this is not all. The writer of an article on Biblical Chaldee, in the 'Journal of Sacred Literature' for January 1861 (the Rev. J. M'Gill), after a minute analysis of some hundreds of words, showing great critical acquaintance with the language, as well as unwearied perseverance in the examination of it, comes to the following conclusions:—'That the Biblical Chaldee is distinguished by many peculiarities, which mark an early stage of the developement of the

[1] Einleitung, § 133.

[2] Not one of the least proofs of the weakness of the cause of our opponents appears in the manner in which they are driven to resort to such unworthy weapons as raillery and ridicule, as a poor substitute for honest arguments, and a fair canvassing of the questions they impugn. Instance the following:—Hitzig (quoted by Auberlen on Daniel, note p. 150, English Transl.) in speaking of the image of Dan. ch. ii., says, 'The combination of four metals *shows little taste*, and, besides, the treatment of the whole contains many things offensive, and altogether *cannot be called successful*;' and again (cited by Auberlen, p. 150), 'The πρῶτον ψεῦδος in the calculation is the seven weeks, for which the author had to find some place.' In a like spirit, De Wette pronounces the account of the miracle of Dan. vi. 'a *laughable description*' (quoted by Ayre, Horne's Introduction, ch. iv. § vi. p. 849); and Knobel (quoted in Aids to Faith, p. 121) says—'The history of Daniel has a *legendary*, almost *fairy tale* complexion, and represents the events in a manner in which they *could not possibly* have happened.'—Prophetismus ii. 401. This is surely more than irreverent, and looks very like an attempt to put aside by a sneer what cannot be honestly rejected.

Digitized by Google

language. . . . . That Daniel does not approach nearer than Ezra to the language of the Targums,' and, what is of no small value to our present purpose, that 'there are one or two phenomena which show that the Book of Daniel was written a considerable time before that of Ezra.' Such is one of the results of the increased philological knowledge of the present day; and it does seem an interesting illustration of the words of the Psalmist (Ps. cxix. 140), 'Thy word is tried to the uttermost, and thy servant loveth it;' tried even to its inmost texture, and it bears, nay benefits by, the test. In the accounts of recent Assyrian excavations, we read of sun-burnt bricks, inscribed with the name of Nebuchadnezzar, having been found in the ruins of Babylon, in such profusion as would seem to show that the language of the monarch himself—'Is not this great Babylon, that I have built?'[1] was not so completely an empty boast as some have thought it. We have here a parallel. The philologist sifts the Chaldee of this Book of Daniel, and, in its archaic forms and peculiarities, he discovers word after word, stamped, as it were, with the image or the date of Daniel, and so testifying to the genuineness of the book. For if the book be not genuine, it is a forgery. If a forgery, then the nearer we assign it to the time of the captivity the greater would become the difficulty of foisting it upon the public as the production of Daniel; while the later we place it after that time, the more difficult would it be, in the fluctuating state of the languages employed, to imitate the exact style which would suit that exact period. Nay, when we come to consider that the perpetrator of the fraud would need a most accurate knowledge, *not* of one

[1] Dan. iv. 30.

Digitized by Google

language, but two—an acquaintance only to be acquired if he wrote at a late period, from documents in existence, belonging to different eras; and that his book must be written, so that the Hebrew should fit exactly the interval between Jeremiah and Chronicles, Ezra, &c., as it does; while the Chaldee should be like that of Ezra, as it is, and yet betraying indications of an earlier date still, though those not to be discovered, save only by the most minute examination: all this is such a refinement in deception as, I think, we are justified in pronouncing impossible. But even if it were thus successfully executed, there still remains the difficulty of understanding how the book could have been accepted by a people so jealously watchful over their Scriptures as we know the Jews to have been.

It appears, then, from the foregoing remarks, that the use itself of these two languages in this book, the *manner* in which they are used, and the particular *form* the two languages here assume, are all perfectly natural if we assume Daniel to be the author, but inconceivably unnatural if anyone else was. I have compared the words, and forms of words, examined by one writer, to the bricks discovered in the ruins of Babylon, and which confirm, in the nineteenth century, a soliloquy of Nebuchadnezzar spoken more than 2,000 years ago. To vary the image, we may compare the two languages, employed in the Book of Daniel, to a pair of those colossal creations of the sculptor which have been found by a Layard, forming the entrance to some chamber rich in Babylonian antiquities, and which Daniel himself may have frequented. These two languages, forming, as it were, the portal by which we are admitted to the chamber of the Book of Daniel, keep their unbroken vigil over the vivid pictures and miraculous records it

Digitized by Google

contains—scenes and inscriptions, graven as it were, on the walls within. Thus is the tongue of Babylon—rescued in this from the curse of Babel—leagued in holy bond with the speech of the chosen people of God, in guarding and asserting the truth of this portion of God's Word; and 'in the mouth of these two witnesses,'—so far at least as their testimony may be fairly employed—'every word may be established' to be, what it purports to be, the language and production of Daniel the prophet.

SECTION VII.

When a book itself claims to be the production of a certain author, its genuineness then becomes so involved in its authenticity that whatever tends to establish the the latter does also, in its degree, confirm the former. The Book of Daniel claims the prophet Daniel as its author;[1] if, therefore, the book be true, it is genuine. Now there are in this second chapter indications of truthfulness continually disclosing themselves to the careful searcher,—grains, as it were, of gold lying on the surface, which, catching the eye, tell of the vein which runs beneath the whole. We discover this, for instance, in the writer's use of the term 'Chaldæans.'[2] The only sense, in which the word seems to have been known to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and even Ezekiel, is as a general name for the inhabitants of Chaldæa: in which sense it is also used twice in the book before us,[3] but here[4] the writer

[1] Chap. vii. 15; viii. 1, 15, *et alibi.*

[2] See an article on the 'Chaldæans,' in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

[3] Chap. v. 30; ix. 1.

[4] Chap. ii. 2, 4, 5, 10; also iv. 7; v. 7.

Digitized by Google

evidently employs it of a particular class of men, as synonymous, or nearly so, with the Hebrew Khartummim, or wise men. From other sources of information [1] we gather that these men formed a learned body, or what might be called an university at Babylon, and devoted themselves not merely to religious but generally to literary and scientific pursuits. They were the only persons who retained the knowledge and use of the ancient Cushite language of the Kaldi, whence their name.[2] In this language, as the recently discovered Assyrian inscriptions prove,[3] astronomical and other learning was still preserved; and it had already formed a part of Daniel's education.[4] Hence we get two arguments in favour of the truth and genuineness of this book.

First, we here have traces of such an intimate acquaintance with Babylonian institutions as we might expect in Daniel the prophet; though apparently it was not possessed by those other Jewish writers above alluded to, who did not enjoy his advantages in this respect. The writer of this Book of Daniel uses the term in two senses; and though in one of these it is not found anywhere else in Scripture, yet we gather from external sources of information that it was correct.

Secondly, exception has been taken to the truth of this book, on the ground that Daniel, though a Jew, is said to have been enrolled among the 'Chaldæans.' Now,

[1] See Smith's Dictionary, s. v. 'Chaldæans.'

[2] The term 'Chaldæan' came ultimately to be associated exclusively with astrology, and the practice of occult science as professed by astrologers. Comp. Juvenal, Sat. vi. 533, x. 94; Cic. de Div. 2, 47.

[3] Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. i. p. 255, note 9, and 480, note 2, 2nd ed.

[4] Conf. Dan. chap. i. 4.

Digitized by Google

though it is not the object of a work like the present to refute all the objections which may be raised against the Book of Daniel, and which must have sorely tasked the minds, as well as the assurance of the objectors, so far fetched are they in some instances, so paltry in others, yet I may just pause in this case to point out, by the way, how entirely any such argument is overthrown by the above explanation. Had the term 'Chaldæan' been here used in the sense in which other Scripture writers employ it, the objection would have been a valid one. But the name, we now see, is not that of a nation, not that of a tribe even, nor of an exclusively religious body, but of a class, the qualification for admission into which was not a matter of birth nor of religious persuasion, but of intellectual culture and capacity,[1] qualifications preeminently distinguishing the prophet Daniel. Here indeed is the harmony of truth, when ignorance thought to detect a lie.

SECTION VIII.

I may here notice, with reference to the prophetic dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, a circumstance pointed out by Rawlinson in his Bampton Lectures,[2] and previously alluded to by Barnes;[3] namely that Nebuchadnezzar is the only sovereign of those with whom the Jews were in any way brought into contact, who is declared

[1] Themistocles was admitted, apparently, among the Chaldæans. (See Plutarch's Life of Themistocles.) Apuleius, Jamblichus, Porphyry and others, assert that Pythagoras also studied at Babylon; and, if so, where but under the Chaldæans? See article on 'Early History of Babylonia,' in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xv. part 2, page 253, note 3.

[2] Lect. v. note 16, p. 27.

[3] Introduction to Commentary on Daniel, p. 78.

Digitized by Google

by any profane writer to have had the gift of prophecy. Abydenus, in a passage quoted by Eusebius,[1] states that under the influence of divine inspiration, Nebuchadnezzar prophesied to the Babylonians the calamity that was about to come upon them. When we compare this with the prophetic character of the dream recorded in this chapter, which on interpretation announces that his kingdom was to be superseded by another (ii. 39), the coincidence is curious, and serves with all the force of independent testimony to establish, at least, the *probability* of the truthfulness of the account before us.

SECTION IX.

The cruel nature of the decree in this second chapter (ver. 12), and the manner in which Daniel is rewarded by the king (ver. 48), have both been made the grounds of objection against the book on the score of their improbability. On consideration, however, they rather seem to possess such a degree of verisimilitude as should confirm our belief in its credibility, and therein its genuineness. The capricious and excessive cruelty of eastern despots, and the sudden elevation of men, even of the lowest order to high positions must be known to anyone at all versed in oriental history and literature.

[1] Euseb. Præp. Ev. ix. 41, pp. 441, 442. The words of Nebuchadnezzar, as given by Abydenus are these:—*ὦ Βαβυλώνιοι, τὴν μέλλουσαν ὑμῖν προαγγέλλω συμφορὴν, τὴν οὔτε Βῆλος, ἐμὸς πρόγονος, οὔτε βασίλεια Βῆλτις ἀποτρέψαι μοίρας πεῖσαι δσθενοῦσιν. κ.τ.λ.* Where the last words evidently imply that Nebuchadnezzar was now aware of the existence of some power greater than his God Belus or Beltis. How entirely, yet how indirectly, does this agree with the accounts of the book of Daniel, where the king is represented as saying of the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, 'There is no other God that can deliver after this sort!' Dan. iii. 29.

Digitized by Google

In confirmation of the one I might refer to the revolting refinements in cruelty recorded by Plutarch in his life of Artaxerxes;[1] the other is a feature entering very commonly into eastern story,[2] and appearing in the history of Joseph as well as that of Daniel. I do not, however, wish to lay any great stress on details of this kind, since from their very nature they would be likely to occur even to one who was *making* his account; but they have their value when blended with much besides, which we can scarcely conceive to have been the work of an impostor; and of this I think we shall see enough before we have done with the chapter.

SECTION X.

I detect signs of truthfulness and genuineness in the following. We gather from the account given from

[1] The decree of Ahasuerus for the destruction of the Jews throughout his kingdom (Esth. iii. 13) is a scriptural instance of even greater cruelty than that of Nebuchadnezzar. Herodotus (book iii. chap. 159) says, that when Darius took Babylon he impaled 3,000 of the principal men—a practice which, Layard tells us, is often represented in Assyrian sculpture. Herodotus also relates (book iii. chap. 79) a general massacre of Magi; in commemoration of which a day was annually observed called 'The Magophonia.' In modern times, too, Eastern events have afforded a parallel. In 1843, Beder Khan Bey invaded the Tiyari districts, and massacred in cold blood nearly 10,000 of the inhabitants. Layard's Nineveh and its Remains, vol. i. p. 73, note.

[2] Compare the story of Abdûlla, a peasant nominated governor of Khorassan, and that of Ahmed the cobbler, elevated to the viziership, as given by Sir J. Malcolm in his Sketches of Persia. Justin I., Emperor of Constantinople, was originally a Thracian peasant. The Russian Prince Potemkin, illustrious in the last century both as statesman and soldier, was also of low origin. Herodotus supplies us with two parallel instances—in Pactyas (Herod. lib. i. cap. 153) and Xenagoras (lib. ix. cap. 107). Instances occur without number in the history of the modern Ottoman Empire.

Digitized by Google

verses 2–13 of this chapter (ii.), though it is nowhere expressly stated in so many words, that neither Daniel nor his three companions were present among 'the wise men,' whom the king first consulted about his dream. Yet, no sooner has the decree gone forth for the slaughter of the magi, than he and 'his fellows' are at once sought out, 'to be slain' (13). It is not difficult to account for this. The events here related must have occurred very shortly after the occasion when Nebuchadnezzar had communed with these four children of Israel, and 'found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers in the realm (i. 20, 21). The reputation then acquired could scarcely fail to stir up the envy of those to whom they were declared so much superior.[1]

And we can well imagine that while it was owing to that envy that the royal summons was not, in the first instance, made known to them, in order if possible to exclude them from an opportunity of displaying their superiority, and so throwing the native wise men into the shade, the same feeling against them would at once lead to their seizure when the magi were condemned. None of this, however, is given by the writer. He simply states, and barely states, the facts which are necessary for the understanding of his narrative, and then hurries on to the more important parts beyond; as would, indeed, be most natural in Daniel, himself concerned in that sequel, and fully impressed with its consequence; though we can hardly imagine an impostor leaving his details thus unexplained and incomplete.

[1] We have envious feelings prompting 'certain Chaldæans' to attempt the death of the three companions of Daniel in the very next chapter (iii. 8-12); and instigating the presidents and princes to compass that of Daniel himself, in chap. vi. 45. Compare also Haman's envy of Mordecai (Esth. iii. 5; v. 13).

Digitized by Google

SECTION XI.

A similar *incompleteness* in the narrative occurs immediately after the one just pointed out. Having given the decree, and stated that its execution was commenced, the writer relates how Daniel obtained at first a temporary respite, and ultimately its total revocation for himself and his three companions; but not a word more of the magi. I cannot believe that an impostor would have written thus. Having mentioned a fact of so grave a nature, he would not have left that mention so incomplete. Either the account was an invention (if the work of such an one), or it was based upon documents or tradition. In neither case would he have introduced a detail of this kind without premeditation; and the very wish that his book should appear the production of one living among the events it describes, would have made him carefully work out each step in the narrative, when once introduced. But if Daniel were the writer, then we can understand how, hurried along by the peculiar interest which the *subsequent* details would possess in his eye, he would only give these introductory ones a passing notice, and no more. The decree of Nebuchadnezzar was a link in the connected chain of events which led to the miraculous *dénouement*, which it was his special purpose to record; but the execution or pardon of the magi was not. The one, therefore, is given; the other passed over. Yet only one who was aware that what he stated, was too well known to be contradicted, and who wrote with all the confidence a sense of his own truthfulness would arm him with, would have ventured to make such an omission as this.

Digitized by Google

More evidence of this particular nature might be found in the chapter; but I content myself with this. It may, perhaps, appear to some too trivial to have any value, nor do I wish to advance it as worth more than it may be fairly estimated at. But it is a peculiarity of this kind of testimony that it *grows upon* us, in the studying of it. Once set the thought in motion, and, in Virgilian phrase, '*vires acquirit eundo*.'

SECTION XII.

In verse 16 I discover an indication of the writer's familiarity with the palace of Babylon; yet disclosed in so incidental a manner, as could not have been the result of design.

From verse 24 we learn that admission into the royal presence was obtained through Arioch; Daniel evidently could *not* enter by himself. Yet in verse 16, the writer says of Daniel that '*he went in*, and desired of the king that he would give him time.' Here evidently he went *alone*. How then are the two passages to be reconciled? I conceive that this expression, 'went in,' means no more than that Daniel proceeded to some chamber or office in the palace, probably at the public entrance or gateway[1] (comp. Esth. ii. 21), where application to the sovereign could be made at some seasons, or hours, personally, at other times through appointed officials—of whom, it would seem, Daniel himself shortly became one (ver. 49). In this case, probably, the application

[1] 'On entering the castle of Yezidi,' says Layard (Nineveh and Babylon), 'we found the chieftain seated "in the gate," a vaulted entrance, with deep recesses on either side, used as places of business by day, or rest by night.' See also 2 Sam. xix. 8; 2 Kings vii. 1, 18; 2 Chron. xviii. 9; Dan. ii. 49.

Digitized by Google

was made through an official; nor does the expression, 'desired of the king,' necessarily imply anything more than 'petitioned of the king,' which might be very well effected through the instrumentality of another. But verse 24 relates a *formal* introduction to the sovereign, and probably at an unusual hour; for it is said that 'Arioch' now 'brought in Daniel before the king *in haste*,' i.e. *at once* on his presenting himself, without waiting for the time when persons were *ordinarily* presented. Be this, however, as it may, the writer's familiarity with the court comes out, I think, in the expression, 'went in,' evidently used unconsciously in verse 16. If written by Daniel, it was written by one of whom it is said (i. 19) that he 'stood before the king,' i.e. had employment at the palace. In such an one it would be most natural to say barely that he 'went in,' without specifying into what place he 'went,' to make his request, knowing—if, indeed, he thought of it at all—that such an expression would be understood by all; but most probably using it unconsciously, *from force of habit*. But that an impostor, especially one not acquainted with the life and observances of a palace, would *not* have spoken thus, we may be certain.[1] It is the phrase of one himself in the *habit* of *going in*, and to

[1] This is a piece of evidence of the same nature as those adduced by Professor Blunt, in his 'undesigned coincidences' for 'the veracity of the Gospels and Acts,' §§ vi. and x. 'How natural,' he says, 'for him (St. Matthew) not to perceive that there was vagueness and obscurity in the term, which to himself was definite and plain.' The words apply to the instance I have adduced as much as to his own; as well as his concluding words on one of the above passages—'These are small matters, but such as bespeak truth in those who detail them.' That very smallness, I argue, gives them additional value; since the greater their insignificance, the less likely are they to have been the result of design and artifice.

Digitized by Google

such an one plain and definite, though to any one else vague and obscure.

SECTION XIII.

In verses 37, 38, Daniel is describing the vast power of Nebuchadnezzar, and the character of his kingdom. He is 'a king of kings,' for God has given him 'a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory.' The character of his power is described in these words:—'Wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath He (God) given into thine hand.' To these last words the Greek version in the LXX., properly that of Theodotion, adds, 'and the fishes of the sea.'[1] Now, though this description is evidently a figurative one, yet we look for appropriateness even in figures. I contend, then, that the expression, as found in the Hebrew, is so much more appropriate than that of the Greek, as to show a more intimate acquaintance with the real character of Nebuchadnezzar's power. The expression in the Hebrew (and which our own version translates literally) is an appropriate figure for a kingdom powerful by *land;* the whole expression, including the addition found in the Greek, would fittingly apply to a kingdom powerful by *sea* as well as by land. Now, which is the truest representation of the power of Nebuchadnezzar? We

[1] In the edition of the LXX. recently published by the Society for the promotion of Christian Knowledge, these additional words are omitted; yet I find them in an old copy of the LXX. printed at Cambridge in 1665, 'juxta exemplar Vaticanum;' and they are referred to by Lowth in his commentary on the passage. The Vulgate, too, (my edition is one printed at Rome, 1628, 'ex auctoritate Sixti V. P. Max.,' an avowedly corrupt one, which, however, rather strengthens than injures my argument,) has the words 'et pisces maris dedit in manu tuâ.'

Digitized by Google

read of vast Babylonian or Assyrian armies, and of conquests by land, but nothing is said of any skill or supremacy by sea; and I find it stated by Layard,[1] that, though among the recently discovered ruins in Khorsabad and Kouyunjik naval engagements are occasionally depicted, yet in the most ancient palace of Nimroud only bas-reliefs with a river have been discovered; and the vessels (clearly of Assyrian construction) differ from those of the former, which, to judge of the costume of the men, must have belonged to *enemies* or *allies*. He adds that the Assyrian was '*properly an inland* power.' There is a passage of Menander also, quoted by Josephus,[2] apparently confirmatory of this. Shalmaneser is there said to have received sixty ships and eight hundred seamen from the Phœnicians, to aid him in a war undertaken on behalf of the king of Tyre, against several of the neighbouring towns which had revolted. Evidently there were no Assyrian ships employed here. It is true that these details of Assyria do not, strictly speaking, apply to Babylon. But the two kingdoms were so much alike, and so nearly one and the same, though at different periods, that what is true of the former may be in this respect safely predicated of the latter. It would appear then that the translator of the book of Daniel into Greek — slipping perhaps unconsciously into the scriptural formula, 'the fowls of the air, and fish of the sea,'[3] or making the addition intentionally, as thinking the figure incomplete without

[1] Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. p. 379.

[2] J. A lib. ix. chap. xiv. Herodotus also (lib. i. cap. cxliii.) says of the Persians that they were not a naval people—*οὔτε αὐτοὶ οἱ Πέρσαι ναυβάται*; the similarity of position would lead us to expect the character of the Babylonians to be the same.

[3] Gen. i. 26, 28; ix. 2, &c.

Digitized by Google

it—was really putting in a superfluous and false touch to the picture; while the original writer knows the true character of the rule of Nebuchadnezzar, and hits it off correctly. Yet I cannot help thinking that an impostor writing at a later date, and wishing to give his book a scriptural appearance, was just the person to have fallen into the very error which the LXX. translator has done. And in proportion as that was likely, so much the stronger is the evidence in favour of Daniel's authorship of the book.[1]

SECTION XIV.

It is not my purpose here to enter into the investigation of this dream of the monarch, or its appropriateness to symbolise future events; but I must say that the form and nature of the vision have a correspondence to the place and the times in which it is represented as having occurred, such as could scarcely have been the invention of an impostor. It cannot be denied that our very dreams take their colouring from our daily experiences. The image seen in this dream is a great one; great, too, was much of the statuary which adorned the

[1] A precisely similar argument is to be derived from the statement in chap. v. 2, that women were present at the royal banquet. So improbable did such a circumstance appear to the LXX. translators, that they omitted it. From Xenophon, however, we learn that this was customary at the Babylonian court before the Persian invasion; and Layard says that among the Assyrian sculptures women continually appear at banquets. (Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. 411.) So that, though the case of Vashti (Esth. i. 10, 11) can scarcely be quoted as a parallel instance; yet we find in the writer of this book just the knowledge which would be possessed by Daniel living at the time—in a matter, too, where an impostor, like the translators, would have been almost sure to have fallen unconsciously into error. See Horne's Introd., Ayre's edition, ch. iv. § vi. p. 844.

Digitized by Google

court of the king;[1] this much we gather from modern enquiry; and great was the image, described in the very next chapter, as set up on the plains of Dura. The use of gold in the construction of such images, though not limited to that age, was yet more general then than at any other time,[2] from the vast treasure that was accumulated in the conquest of different countries.[3] Of this material, too, was the image described in the next chapter, i.e. plated with gold,[4] for we can scarcely suppose that it was solid.

Clay, too, was no doubt a material of general use in the construction of such objects, internally, if not externally. Babylon itself was a city of clay, being built almost entirely of the sun-burnt bricks. Hence we can imagine such an image, of metal of different kinds combined with clay, occurring to the mind of Nebuchadnezzar, in the midst of such scenes, and occupied, too, as he must have been continually, with such subjects—for he almost rebuilt Babylon; but an impostor would

[1] The vast scale of the buildings, cities, walls, &c. of the great Oriental empires is everywhere alluded to, and has nowhere been imitated or excelled.

[2] Herodotus, book i. ch. 183, says that in the temple of Babylon, among a variety of golden ornaments and articles of furniture suited to such a place, there was an image 12 cubits high, of solid gold. Diodorus Siculus, book iii. (quoted by Lowth and Prideaux) mentions a statue of solid gold, 40 feet high, taken by Xerxes out of the temple of Belus, worth, at the lowest computation, 3,500,000*l.* sterling. Prideaux, Connection, vol. i. p. 96.

[3] When Nineveh was taken it contained 25,000,000,000*l.* (!) sterling in gold. (Compare the prophecy of Nahum ii. 9, 'Take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold; *there is none end* of the store and glory out of all the pleasant furniture.') According to Diodorus the gold taken from the temple of Belus alone, by Xerxes, amounted to 21,000,000*l.* Layard, Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. 417, note.

[4] Even the walls of the city of Ecbatana were partly plated with gold and silver. Herodotus, book i. ch. 98.

Digitized by Google

scarcely have hit upon such a representation by accident, and would have been equally unlikely to design it himself without any scriptural precedent.

SECTION XV.

There is an expression in verse 39 which I think would not have been employed by one writing at a later date, since it apparently involves an inaccuracy. Daniel says in the interpretation of the king's dream, 'After *thee* shall arise another *kingdom*,' meaning that the Babylonian *dynasty* would be superseded by another, that of the Medo-Persian sovereigns. The expression, 'after *thee*,' seems to imply that this would follow immediately on the reign of Nebuchadnezzar; yet there were four more sovereigns sat on the throne of Babylon before this change took place. Now we, looking back, as we do, from a distance, can understand how the prophet Daniel, regarding Nebuchadnezzar as the representative of the dynasty to which he belonged, might use the expression 'after thee,' as equivalent to 'after thy kingdom,' i.e. 'after the particular dynasty of which thou art now the representative;'[1] but this would have appeared too like an inaccuracy to have been adopted by an impostor, anxious about his book's credibility, and who lived at an age when all these things had been accomplished, and who knew that it was after Labynetus (and Belshazzar), rather than after Nebuchadnezzar that the change took place.

[1] Mede, in his Halifax sermons, p. 115, says that, in explanation of these prophecies, 'by a king we are to understand a state or kingdom, under whatever form it may happen to be administered.' Indeed, it is a figure by no means uncommon in prophecy. See Isaiah xxiii. 15; Rev. xvii. 10, 12.

Digitized by Google

SECTION XVI.

In verse 46 it is said, that 'Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours before him.' Here was unquestionably an act of idolatry. However we might be inclined to reduce the action of the king to mere homage, a token of respect due to a man who was evidently the favoured servant of the most High, yet the offering of incense stamps it as something more. Now we should have expected that Daniel would deprecate a proceeding like this, and prevent the further worship of 'the creature rather than the Creator,'[1] yet it is not said that he did so. The silence of the writer, however, by no means implies that he allowed it; this is only another instance of the incompleteness of detail into which he unconsciously falls when any particular point is not essential to the purpose of his narration, and from the following verse, in which the glory is assigned by the king to the true God, we should infer that Daniel *had* put him right on this head.

But an impostor, careful, perhaps over-careful, of the garb in which he dressed his narration, would certainly have avoided such an omission, almost implicating Daniel, as it would seem to him, in countenancing an

[1] Compare and contrast the conduct of St. Peter, Acts x. 25, 26. The Greek describing Cornelius' act of worship is the same there, *προσεκύνησεν*, as in the LXX. of Daniel, ii. 46. To this may be added the expressions of Justin (Apolog. i. c. 20), *θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν*; and again (c. 16, ibid.), *θεὸν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν*, The act, however, *in itself*, might have passed merely as one of a becoming homage, were it not for the offering of incense which accompanied it. For the different uses of *προσκυνεῖν*, see Wordsworth, Grk. Test. Apoc. xiii. 4.

Digitized by Google

act of idolatry. While the prophet himself, confident in his own integrity and reputation, could well afford to pass over such a matter, in the full assurance that such a charge would be the last to be brought against him.

I have now run through the second chapter of this book, tracing, at the several points where it reveals itself, the golden thread of truth, which seems so closely and inseparably intertwined with warp and woof, that I cannot but believe the narration throughout to be, in colloquial phrase, 'all of a piece;' and if such is the conclusion to which these little incidental expressions and omissions bring us, they do indeed lose their insignificance, and become of the greatest value. On the strength of such evidence we may say of the writer of this book, as is said of the boy Samuel,[1] 'The Lord was with him, and did let *none of his words fall to the ground;*' nay his very silence speaks.

SECTION XVII.

In the third chapter of the book of Daniel occur most of those non-Semitic words which have been adduced by some as an internal testimony that the book belongs to a later age than that assigned to Daniel the prophet. I therefore take this opportunity of discussing the whole of this class of words once for all. Not that, as I have before observed, it falls within the scope of a work like the present to overthrow piecemeal the various arguments which assurance or ingenuity may have advanced against the book; the *positive* evidence in its *favour* is what I am concerned with; but there are instances in

[1] 1 Sam. iii. 19.

Digitized by Google

which the weapons of opponents may be turned upon themselves; and this, I think, is one.

A list of words is given by Eichhorn [1] and Bertholdt,[2] all of which were at one time considered to be of Greek extraction, and on the strength of which, along with other peculiar features of the book, Strauss has called its author 'the Maccabæan Daniel.' It is now, however, generally admitted [3] that not more than four out of this number, if indeed so many,[4] really evince such an origin; and these occur among the names of musical instruments given in verses 5, 7, 10 of the present chapter, and are translated in our authorised version, 'harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer.'[5] But neither in the words themselves, nor in the manner in which they are introduced is there anything to warrant the conclusion which has been based upon them. For surely, in the first place, there is nothing extraordinary in the fact, if fact it be, that a

[1] Einleitung, in A. T. vol. iii. p. 347. [2] Pp. 24, 25.

[3] De Wette, Einleitung, 255 b.; compare Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Book of Daniel,' § 10.

[4] The writer of the review of 'Bunsen's Biblical Researches' (Essays and Reviews, p. 76) contents himself with naming two, though his statement is full of errors. (See Payne Smith, Messianic Interpretation of Isaiah, note to p. 3, l. 18; where also the whole subject of these words is discussed.)

[5] The four words are these:—קִיתָרוֹס, the Greek *κίθαρα*; סַבְּכָא, *σαμβυκή*; פְּסַנְתֵּרִין, *ψαλτήριον*; סוּמְפֹּנְיָה, *συμφωνία*. Of the first, it may be said that it is traceable to no Greek root, and probably came originally from an Eastern source. See Chandler's Vindication of Daniel, obj. iii. The second is expressly said by Clemens Alex. (Strom. book i. p. 307) to be a *foreign* instrument; and by Athenæus (i. 4) to be of Syrian origin. The third, though its origin is doubtful, may be allowed to pass as a Greek word; and the fourth would seem to be assignable to no other source. The first two, however, though not of Greek origin, were certainly well known in Greece, which may have, possibly, derived them from the same source as the Assyrians did.

Digitized by Google

land by which the stream of Aryan migration had rolled, more than once, should have received some words or roots, deposited as it were by the passing wave, and whose origin in after ages should be traced back to the family from which they originally came. There are many such words to be found in the language of every country whose population has undergone changes of this kind.[1] Nor again, under any circumstances, would it be thought strange that four apparently Greek words should occur in a proclamation purporting to be addressed to different 'people, nations, and languages' (ver. 4): less still, when it is remembered that the names of musical instruments, and such are these, are frequently adopted along with the instruments themselves from foreign lands.[2] On the other hand, there is abundant evidence, both from writers of antiquity[3] as well as from

[1] The course of the Aryan migrations is traced out by Rawlinson (Herodotus, vol. i. pp. 550, 551, 2nd edition); and appears twice to have fluctuated in the vicinity of Babylonia, ere under the Medo-Persic supremacy it to a certain degree overflowed that country. The Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions contain many words which are evidently akin to words in use in classic Greek—some in almost the same form. The Babylonian goddess of lakes is named by Berosus Θαλάρθ. Here we have the Greek θάλασσα, 'sea,' almost to a letter. Many other instances will occur to those who have read the accounts of recent cuneiform interpretation.

[2] De Wette (Introd. p. 386, 6th edition) admits that it is possible that such instruments and their names may have been known to the Babylonians.

[3] Thales and Pythagoras in the earlier times of Greece, Eudoxus and Aristotle at a later period, are said to have derived instruction from the Chaldæans. Grote, Hist. Greece, vol. iii. chap. 19. In Chandler's Vindication of Daniel, obj. iii. a number of passages are quoted from Greek writers, proving such intercourse, especially with reference to music. The discovery of a psaltery or harp in a tomb at Thebes by Sir G. Wilkinson, where it had been buried long

Digitized by Google

the results of modern discovery,[1] that there was some intercourse between Greece and the seats of the great Eastern powers even earlier than the time of Daniel, especially in matters of art and science; and since Greece herself undoubtedly borrowed extensively from such sources, there is no reason why we may not suppose the influence to have been, in some degree, mutual. Indeed Grotius, who was the first to single out the majority of the words once referred to this class, was content to attribute them all to the influence of the Greek colonies in Asia Minor: and though we could scarcely have considered that an adequate cause for their introduction, had all the words he adduced been really of Greek extraction, yet it is certainly sufficient to account for the few stray terms we find here.

When a Layard discovers traces of such intercourse in the remains of Assyrian sculpture, we do not at once assign those remains to a later date than that to which they have been usually regarded as belonging; neither need we do so in the case of the book of Daniel. Rather we

before the age of Daniel, shows that such instruments were known at that day.

[1] See Layard's Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. pp. 286-7, note; where he adduces several proofs that an influence of this kind existed even so far back as the times of Semiramis and Sardanapalus. Other interesting notices of it are scattered about the book. At Khorsabad (vol. ii. p. 273), Nimroud, and Kouyunjik (p. 274), traces of an acquaintance with the Ionic type of architecture have been found. They belong to the seventh or eighth century B.C., and are, no doubt, prototypes of what was one day to prevail in Greece. Circular altars have been found at Khorsabad, very similar to the Greek tripod (p. 469); and the fircone which surmounted the thyrsus of Bacchus is of common occurrence in Assyrian sculpture (p. 471). On the other hand, at Xanthus a fragment of a tomb of Assyrian type has been found (p. 292); and pieces of sculpture recently found at Athens closely resemble those at Persepolis (p. 293, note).

Digitized by Google

should consider that the pen of the writer incidentally reveals what the chisel of the sculptor confirms. And it would indeed seem that we have here evidence *for* the book's genuineness rather than against it; for were it a forgery, one of two things is probable—either in his over-anxiety to give his book the appearance of having been written at Babylon, the author would have carefully eschewed all such words; or else, this point having escaped his consideration, and writing at a period when Greek influence had increased (as it did), he would inadvertently have admitted more traces of it. While, then, the mere occurrence of these words indicates *some* intercourse between Greece and Babylon, their paucity would argue a date when that intercourse had not yet been carried to any great extent; both of which considerations would serve to confine the book to a period, not much anterior to, nor much later than the time at which it professes to have been written, and so in no small degree they confirm its genuineness as well, since the nearer we bring it to the time of Daniel the greater would be the difficulty of forgery.

I now proceed to the other words,[1] *once* supposed to

[1] They are the following:—פַּרְתֻּמִּים, chap. i. 3; אֲשָׁפִים, chap. i. 20; נְבִזְבָה, chap. ii. 6, chap. v. 17. The rest occur in the chapter under consideration (chap. iii.), and are some of the titles of officers mentioned in vv. 2, 3: פַּתְגָם, 'matter,' ver. 16 (and iv. 17); כָּרוֹז, 'a herald,' and כָּרַז, 'to cry out,' ver. 4; and פַּטִּישׁ, 'hosen,' ver. 21. The word אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנַיָּא, chap. iii. 2, 'princes,' which is the Greek *σατράπης*, has been found by Rawlinson in the Behistun inscription. Concerning this word, therefore, notwithstanding its resemblance to the Greek (which is, no doubt, derived from it, or the same word in Greek characters), there is positive proof of the correctness of our author, justifying the assumption that he is equally so in the other words in question as in this. See Rawlinson's Herod. vol. i. p. 264, note 1, 2nd edition.

Digitized by Google

belong to the same class as the four we have been discussing.

Having failed to establish their Greek origin, objectors to the book would doubtless wish them to fall back into unnoticed obscurity. But since they have been brought forward as witnesses for examination, though they may have failed to support the cause for which they were advanced,[1] it is but fair that we should be allowed to enquire what their testimony is. Haply it may support our cause more successfully than it has done that of our opponents. Now these terms, though certainly not of Greek origin, cannot be assigned to either of the languages in which the Book of Daniel was originally composed. It is to be observed, too, that with the exception of two,[2] they all occur in the Aramaic portion of the book. The question then arises — Can their presence be accounted for, and does it, in any way, bear upon the genuineness of the book? Now it appears that the increased acquaintance of scholars of the present day with the ancient languages of the East, has enabled them to trace all these words, once erroneously referred to a Greek source, to a Persian or Zendic origin.[3] And

[1] Kirms, the latest writer on this subject, gives up all objection to the book on the ground of these foreign words. Horne's Introd. note by Ayre, p. 843; and Hengstenberg, Authenticity of Daniel, pp. 15, 16.

[2] Of these two exceptions, one, אִשְׁפִּים (in chap. i. 20), refers to a class of persons peculiar to the heathen nations of the East, and, therefore, it is a name not likely to have had its counterpart in the Hebrew language; the other, פַּרְתֻּמִּים (chap. i. 3), is of Persian origin, but also occurs in the Hebrew of Esther (i. 3; vi. 9).

[3] See Barnes' Introduction to his Comm. on the Book of Daniel, § ii. pp. 25-29, ed. 1853, and various authorities quoted there. See also Mill, 'On the Historical Character of St. Luke's First Chapter' (Christian Advocate's publication for 1841), pp. 64-68, where the subject of these foreign words is discussed with the profound learn-

Digitized by Google

as one of the terms employed, that rendered in chap. i. 20, 'astrologers,' is expressly used with reference to the Chaldæans; and another (the 'hosen' of chap. iii. 21) refers to the dress worn by men who had been enrolled among the Chaldæans, so it would seem probable that the whole of these words were in use in the ancient language of the Chaldæan schools. But what more natural than that these Chaldæans, men, as they were, of such learning and influence, should have introduced or preserved in use these terms previously employed in their own tongue! They, to whom kings were indebted for their thrones,[1] were likely to leave traces of their influence in the constitution; and the names of government offices were just the form in which it would appear as a matter of course. Moreover, the learned Dr. Mill remarks that this Aramaic vernacular is 'distinguished beyond other Semitic dialects for its ready admission of foreign words;' which appears not only in the occurrence of the words here under consideration, but in the facility with which, under subsequent foreign rulers, it dropped old terms and substituted new ones, according to the power for the time being predominant.[2]

ing for which the writer was distinguished; from which passage my argument here is mainly borrowed.

[1] Berosus relates that on the death of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, hastening home, found the government in the hands of the Chaldeans, the chief of whom was keeping the throne vacant for him. (Quoted by Josephus, J. A. x. 11.)

[2] As a remarkable evidence of this, Mill says (in the passage referred to in the last note but one), that a comparison of the original of chap. iii. 1-3, with later Syriac versions, shows an almost verbal coincidence, *except where the foreign names of the magistrates occur.* These having all, with one exception, become obsolete; that one exception, however, 'of a nature to strengthen our observation.' But see the whole passage, which is too long to quote.

Digitized by Google

This being the case, had the book been written, as some have alleged, in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, it is almost certain that other terms would have been used in place of these Zendic ones; which would by that time have passed into disuse. At all events, they are the very terms to be in vogue at the time of Daniel the prophet, when Chaldæan influence prevailed; and if a later writer had introduced them, with the design of giving his book the appearance of belonging to that age, the fraud would indeed have been a clever one, but still such as would have been most likely to reveal itself, in one way or another. Hence we get an argument from these words in favour of the very opposite conclusion to that for which they have been adduced by some. In the words of Dr. Mill, their occurrence 'proves the composition of the book at the very Medo-Persic period of which it treats, and that its fabrication in the time of the Maccabees, two centuries after the suppression of these magistracies by Grecian ones, is not only a gratuitous supposition, but an inadmissible one.' And if the book be the production of those times its genuineness is indeed almost a matter of moral certainty.

SECTION XVIII.

It is to be observed that the very introduction of the narration contained in this third chapter of the Book of Daniel is in favour of the book's genuineness. An impostor wishing to *personate* Daniel would not have detailed circumstances so totally unconnected with him, without remark or comment, or some attempt to link them with his history. If Daniel, however, be the writer, his object is not so much to speak of himself as to show how marvellously God interposes for the help of his true

Digitized by Google

servants in their time of trial. And the narration in this chapter entirely accords with such a design.

SECTION XIX.

There is one other feature in this third chapter worth pointing out, since it appears to indicate the unconscious confidence of one who is writing the truth, and has nothing to conceal; and that is the absence of all mention of Daniel, as in any way involved in the circumstances it details. That he was not even present would appear certain. Whether we have any clue to the reason of his absence, in the difference between the offices assigned to him and his three companions, as mentioned in the previous ch. (v. 48–49), can only be matter of conjecture. It is there stated that while they were set 'over the affairs of the province of Babylon;' Daniel was made ruler over 'the *whole* province' and sat 'in the gate of the king.' There is evidently a difference here implied. Did, then, the more extensive nature of the charge entrusted to Daniel carry him at times to a distance from the capital:[1] and may we so account for his absence on this occasion? or was the more intimate nature of his official connection with the sovereign such as to render him secure against the machinations of malice? It certainly had not that effect in the reign of Darius, when, notwithstanding his position as the first of the three presidents set over the kingdom, his enemies had the address to get him cast into the lion's den. Possibly the characters of the two monarchs Nebuchadnezzar and Darius may account for this; the latter

[1] As we find him doing 'the king's business,' at 'Shushan the palace,' in chap. viii. 2; and, in chap. x. 4, probably at Nineveh for the same purpose.

Digitized by Google

being a man of weak mind, the former possessed of considerable firmness and judgement, and moreover seemingly entertaining a partiality for Daniel. But whatever are the probabilities, we cannot, in the present state of our knowledge on this subject, advance beyond conjecture. But I argue that had the book been written by an impostor, this question would not have been left thus obscure. Personating Daniel, he would have been careful to account for his absence on this, the most trying crisis in the life of his three friends. But if Daniel were himself the writer, then we can understand how, dealing, as we have before noticed to be his manner, only with the facts necessary to the connection of his narration, he says nothing about himself, leaving his absence to be accounted for as it best might be; while, strong in the consciousness of his own integrity, he can discard all fears of his silence being misunderstood or misrepresented. Thus the *incompleteness* of the account is stronger evidence of the writer's being what he professes to be, than we could have found in the fullest explanation.

SECTION XX.

It may be mentioned as a further confirmation of the truth of the account contained in this chapter, that there is even to this day a place known by the name of Dura, situated between Tekrit and Baghdad.[1] Whether it be the same as the one intended here is another question. It at least proves the existence of the name, and so far the fact has its value.[2]

[1] Layard's Nin. and Bab. p. 469.

[2] Rawlinson thinks it doubtful whether this tract ever belonged to Babylon; while he says there is a mound called 'Duair,' at no great distance from Babylon, and on its site there has been dis-

Digitized by Google

SECTION XXI.

If the instances of internal and other casual evidence which I adduce become fewer as I advance, it is not by any means from a dearth of such matter, but from the constant repetitions in which, from the very similarity of their nature, I should of necessity be involved, were I to discuss every piece of testimony which presents itself. I wish to approach the subject I have taken in hand on as many different sides as possible, and to show that it is the same on all: that the distinct and apparently divergent lines which I discover, all, if followed up, lead to and meet in the same common centre, the genuineness of the book. Repetition to a certain extent is unavoidable, where the witnesses all tell the same tale; but there will be a considerable variety still, when each tells it in his own way.

My first piece of evidence, in the fourth chapter, is of a nature which renders it only available at an advanced stage in the enquiry we are instituting, — not a leading witness in the case, though a valuable subsidiary one. One of the indications of truthfulness which mark the Book of Daniel is the circumstantial manner in which the writer is in the habit of mentioning different officials and individuals,[1] sometimes by name[2] and not always to

covered, by M. Oppert, the pedestal of a colossal statue. See Smith's Dict. of Bible, s.v. Dura.

[1] Compare Dan. iii. 27.

[2] Compare Dan. i. 3, 6, 7, 11; ii. 14; iii. 30. In chap. iii. 8, and again in vi. 4, &c., there is a generous omission of any names, when the writer, had he been an impostor inventing his story, or even founding it on tradition or record at a later day, would have been just as likely to give names as elsewhere; but we can understand how Daniel would refrain from so doing, from very generosity,

Digitized by Google

their credit.[1] We see at once that he professes to have no superficial acquaintance with the circumstances he details—that they are events of which he would say, with Æneas, '*quæ ipse vidi et quorum pars magna fui.*' Hence his accounts, on their very surface, are stamped with authority. But the peculiarity is valuable beyond this; for by this very habit of writing, he has virtually secured the testimony of all these individuals (tacit indeed, but not the less consentient) to the truth of what he says.

When a writer of contemporary history specifies the various persons concerned in the events he records, especially if he exhibits them in an unfavourable light, he not only lays himself open to contradiction if his statements are untrue, but in circumstances of any importance he is certain to incur it. Now I have said that the evidence, in the particular case with which we are at present dealing, becomes available only at an advanced stage in our enquiry. When, from other evidence, we are satisfied that the book before us really belongs to the age of which it treats, though on the question of the authorship we may not yet be fully decided, at that point we find fresh and independent evidence in this feature of the book to which I have drawn attention. I consider that the very strongest testimony as to the age of the book of Daniel *has been already* adduced[2] in the discussion of its language and other features; and more will follow as we proceed. To

though it would be a refinement in imitation almost inconceivable, supposing the book a forgery.

[1] As in the present instance (iv. 7, 18), and, indeed, in the whole account of the manner in which Nebuchadnezzar experienced the fulfilment of the dream. See also chap. v. 8; vi. 4, 24.

[2] See especially § vi. which, I think, is a piece of evidence utterly incontrovertible.

Digitized by Google

any mind, then, which is satisfied on that head, the following argument will not appear unreasonable.

We have in this, the fourth chapter, the writer relating a circumstance of great importance, for it is a royal proclamation arising out of events of a very extraordinary nature; in the relation of this circumstance he represents a large class of persons as signally failing in a matter in which he himself as signally succeeded. Now, being contemporary with these persons (for on that supposition alone the argument has any great value), it is a matter of almost moral certainty that he would not have ventured on such a statement, nor would it have been allowed to circulate, so long as they, or any interested in their reputation, survived, unless it were too true to be gainsayed. On that supposition alone can we account for this narration being found in the book, and this is confirmed when we bear in mind the circumstances of the times; for we have not here a stray copy, which out of an edition of some thousands, escaped the vigilance of public criticism and hostility, for that would be no marvel, but a work written in an age when only the few were capable of such a task, and when its destruction was the easiest thing in the world. Had it been a misrepresentation, nothing could have been more easy than for men of influence such as the Chaldæans to have obtained its suppression. Since, then, they left it unassailed, it follows as a necessary deduction that its veracity must have been unimpeachable. Thus is the whole college of magicians, astrologers, Chaldæans and soothsayers, forced to bear their testimony to the truth of the Book of Daniel; and if the book be true, Daniel the prophet is its author.

Digitized by Google

SECTION XXII.

In vv. 13 and 17 we have the first of several expressions employed by the author, with reference to the offices and ranks of the angels which have been adduced, as evidence that the book belongs to a later date than that assigned to the prophet Daniel. The discussion of this subject, so far as a discussion of it enters in my plan, I shall defer to a later and more suitable occasion.[1] At present it is sufficient to say, that since the terms 'watcher' or 'watchers' do not occur elsewhere in Holy Writ, their presence here furnishes us with a strong argument against the book being a forgery. Such an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, especially of so peculiar a kind, would never have been admitted into the composition of an impostor, from very anxiety that his book should at least *appear* in keeping with the acknowledged Scriptures. We can only account for the presence of peculiarities of this marked character by the supposition that the author writes on his own independent authority, and is so strong in the sense of his own truthfulness, that he can afford to disregard precedent; in short that he writes as one who is himself 'moved by the Holy Ghost,' not in ineffectual imitation of others, who had been so moved before him. This is a remark which applies to several features in the book besides the one now especially before us; the united evidence of all should be strong in proportion to their numbers.

SECTION XXIII.

In ver. 16 we become aware that, *dreamlike*, the vision, or the impression it conveys to the mind, is changing

[1] See § xlviii.

Digitized by Google

from the tree seen by the king, to the thing represented by the tree. Hitherto the 'watcher' has spoken of the tree as a tree; he now says 'let his *heart* be changed from *man's*, and let a beast's heart be given him.' Now it appears to me that an impostor would have carefully eschewed any such transition as this. Wishing to give his book the appearance of an inspired composition, he would have aimed at preserving a harmony and coherency throughout, unless indeed he designedly introduced this change, as corresponding to the fleeting uncertain nature of dreams—an artifice certainly most improbable. But if we suppose the account to be given by one who is acquainted with the whole circumstances, as the speaker (the king) must have been, then it is not only probable that the account is true, but it is also true to nature. And the stronger the evidence of the veracity of the book, the more certain does it become that Daniel is the author of it.

SECTION XXIV.

There are touches of truthfulness discoverable in the 19th verse of this 4th chapter; yet so introduced that it is quite clear they are not the result of design, except indeed the general one of recording the truth. Were they *imitations* only of truth, they would scarcely have been introduced as they are. From the conduct ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar, both here and elsewhere,[1] it would appear that Daniel had acquired considerable influence with him, so as to be regarded with no small degree of favour; a feeling which also seems to have been in some measure mutual. This appears in the following particulars:—While Nebuchadnezzar could not brook delay

[1] See chap. ii. 16, 46, 48, 49.

Digitized by Google

when he questioned others,[1] and became furious when thwarted,[2] there are no indications of anything of the kind in his conduct towards Daniel. The latter's hesitation to reveal the import of this dream, instead of irritating the king, serves only to draw from him a friendly expression of encouragement,[3] tantamount apparently to an assurance that Daniel should not suffer by revealing the truth, however unpalatable it might prove. On the other hand Daniel, who was not the man to shrink from danger, as he had already shown,[4] and afterwards showed in a still more decided manner,[5] yet is at first quite overcome on discovering the import of the dream, and shrinks from revealing a matter bearing so fearfully on the welfare of his sovereign; so that, in answer to the king's expressions of encouragement, he can only at first reply by the exclamation, couched in terms which we may fairly regard as more than the language of courtesy, 'My lord, the dream be to them that hate thee, and the interpretation thereof to thine enemies.' All this is very natural and it is discoverable in this verse, yet *how?* Only in the most indirect manner possible. Nothing is said distinctly of any regard entertained by the king for Daniel, or of the feeling being mutual. It seems, there is just the veil thrown over the

[1] As in chap. ii. 8, 12. [2] As in chap. iii. 13, 19.

[3] This friendly feeling towards Daniel may, perhaps, serve to account for the fact of his not being involved in the charge brought against his three companions, as related in the foregoing chapter. Those who sought their ruin might hesitate to interfere with him, knowing the position in which he stood with their sovereign; they may have thought that a blow could only be struck at him through the previously accomplished downfall of the other three, but that, were he in the first instance involved in the charge, the whole scheme would be rendered abortive through the king's partiality for him.

[4] Chap. i. 8. [5] Chap. vi. 10.

Digitized by Google

workings of the hearts of these two men, and thrown over them in just the delicate manner which we might expect if the account given were the production of one or both of them (and such it probably was: the decree and the whole narration being drawn up by the king's order, and, as would be natural in such a case, under Daniel's supervision, if not actually by his pen), whereas an impostor would have either omitted to touch on such points at all, or would have said more—would have directed the attention more directly to the influence of Daniel with the king, or the king's consideration for Daniel; for this being a studied feature in his narration, as it then would be, he would be unwilling that his labour should be lost, by passing unobserved.

SECTION XXV.

It were scarcely to be expected that in the small range of profane documents, bearing upon the time and country, to which this book professes to belong, *much* should be found confirmatory of its contents. There is, however, at least one passage which appears to allude to something like the affliction here recorded as having befallen Nebuchadnezzar. Abydenus, in a passage to which I have before alluded,[1] makes Nebuchadnezzar foretell the Medo-Persian conquest of Babylon; and he (the king) expresses a wish that before the conqueror might come to accomplish this, he might be swallowed up in some charybdis, or '*might wander through the desert, where there are neither cities nor footsteps of men, but wild beasts have pasturage and birds wander, straying alone among rocks and ravines.*'[2] Now there is so great a similarity

[1] Quoted by Eusebius, Præp. Ev. ix. 41.

[2] See Stuart on Daniel, p. 122.

Digitized by Google

between the language here imputed to Nebuchadnezzar, and that which Daniel employs in the interpretation of his dream, and the expression is on the whole so peculiar, that we can scarcely consider the coincidence as accidental. But how natural would it be for Nebuchadnezzar to speak thus, if the accounts of the Book of Daniel are true, to imprecate upon his enemy the very evil which had been foretold as one day to happen to himself, and which, before he uttered the wish, he had actually himself undergone?

I may couple with this a further piece of evidence on this head, recently brought to light, among the interesting discoveries connected with cuneiform interpretation. In what is called 'the Standard Inscription'[1] Nebuchadnezzar himself speaks of a period of *four* years in his reign as a time of apparent stagnation, when he '*did not rejoice in his heart, built no places of power, laid up no treasures, cleared out no canals, and did not maintain the worship of his God.*' There is here a manifest allusion to some occurrence of the kind recorded in Daniel, and there could scarcely be two periods in the reign of an active ruler like Nebuchadnezzar of which such language could be employed. Moreover, if the Persian custom, mentioned by Theodoret, of distinguishing the year into two seasons, prevailed, as it probably would at Babylon as well, the 'seven times' specified by Daniel (iv. 32), if by them were intended seven of these seasons, would make three and a half *solar* years, or four *current* years, the number here mentioned by Nebuchadnezzar himself. In short, if we consider the nature of the malady and the improbability that a distinct account would be suffered to

[1] See Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. i. p. 424, note 6, and vol. ii. Appendix to Book III. note A, 2nd ed. See also Rawlinson, Bamp. Lectures, p. 131, and note 29 to Lecture v.

Digitized by Google

be perpetuated—for though such a proclamation as that of the chapter before us was in a manner *forced* upon the king, by the miraculous circumstances of the case, at the time of his recovery, yet almost all parties would for 'the glory of the kingdom' subsequently join in suppressing any mention of it, as probably would also the king himself when the first impression had passed off—we shall I think acknowledge that we have stronger evidence here than we might reasonably look for; and if the author of this book, writing at the time when the events took place, and being professedly one who would not be influenced by these motives for disguising or concealing the truth, gives a much more detailed account of the circumstances than anyone else, it only accords the more entirely with what we might expect. If Daniel be the author, it is all natural enough; if anyone else wrote the book, and at a later date, it is most unlikely that he would have been able to obtain a sufficiency of materials to supply so full an account, and not at all likely that he would himself have invented it.

SECTION XXVI.

I have already observed how the claim put forth in v. 30 by Nebuchadnezzar to be the *builder* of Babylon, is confirmed by the vast number of sunburnt bricks, found at this day in the ruins of Babylon, stamped or graven with that monarch's name.[1] But besides this, passages of Berosus and Abydenus are preserved, the former by Josephus (J. A. lib. x. ch. xi.), the latter by Eusebius (Præp. Ev. ix. 40–1), detailing several of the improvements carried out by Nebuchadnezzar; which

[1] Rawlinson (Bamp. Lect. v. note 15, p. 126) says 'nine-tenths of the inscribed bricks' bear this name.

Digitized by Google

appear to have been so extensive as to justify the assertion that he 'rebuilt the city.'[1]

SECTION XXVII.

Not one of the least evidences of the divine origin of our Scriptures is their almost entire exemption from the laws of mortality and decay. Many centuries have elapsed since the writers passed to their rest; but the communications of which they were the appointed channels still survive—survive, too, we may safely say, as nearly as is possible for anything on this earth to do so, in their original integrity. While merely human productions become obsolete, and fall into desuetude, *they* on the contrary, as years roll on, appear to be invested with more and more of meaning and importance. Not only does this hold of the prophetic portions of Scripture, which must of necessity gain in value, as their meaning slowly yet surely evolves itself in the events that come to pass in the world: but in other respects, too, the light gradually 'shining more and more,' harbingers the approach of that 'perfect day' when their truth shall be fully established. To this almost all things are conducing. Does the written word become a bone of contention between men of different sects and views, their own faith may indeed suffer loss, but the word itself profits by the ordeal; light flashing upon it even from the weapons of its foes. Science, art, discovery,

[1] The language of Berosus is—*τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐξαρχῆς πόλιν καὶ ἑτέραν ἔξωθεν προχαρισάμενος καὶ ἀνακαινίσας*; that of Abydenus is to the same effect. The statement of the former writer, that Nebuchadnezzar finished the palace, which he built, in fifteen days, which has appeared to some too absurd to be credited, has been confirmed by the Standard Inscription, which specifies exactly the same time. See Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. ii. p. 487, 2nd ed.

Digitized by Google

all tend, in the main, to contribute to its illumination; and though, for the trial of our faith, there have ever been found in it 'things hard to be understood,' and some seeming inconsistencies—though occasionally phenomena arise which seem at first to militate against its truth—yet even these lessen, rather than increase, as the book advances in age. Ever and anon some fresh fact is brought to light, which serves to remove one more stumbling block from the path of faith. An instance of this occurs in connection with the chapter we are now about to investigate.

The account of the capture of Babylon, given in this, the 5th chapter of the book, accords so closely in some respects with the heathen versions[1] of the taking of that city by Cyrus, that we cannot but identify it as referring to the same event. Yet there are also details in the narrative before us, apparently so irreconcilable with those other accounts, that they have furnished a strong argument against the truth of the book. It is here said that 'Belshazzar the king' was 'slain' on the night of the capture. On the other hand, Berosus[2] states that Nabonnedus was king; that going out to encounter Cyrus, who was advancing upon the city, he was defeated; that he fled to Borsippa, was taken prisoner there, but treated with kindness by the conqueror, and allowed to retire into Carmenia, where he continued to reside to the day of his death. The account of Abydenus[3] is substantially a corroboration of this, except that with him the king's name is Nabanidachus,[4] and he is ap-

[1] Herodotus i. 191; Xenoph. Cyrop. lib. vii. c. v. § 15.

[2] Quoted by Josephus, cont. Ap. i. 20.

[3] Preserved by Eusebius, Præp. Ev. ix. 41, and Chron. i. 10, p. 28.

[4] Josephus (J. A. x. 11) gives the name of this king as Naboandelus; Herodotus i. 77, 78, calls him Labynetus; in the canon of

Digitized by Google

pointed by Cyrus, after his conquest of Babylon, to the governorship of Carmenia. Here then, to all appearance, is a palpable disagreement between the accounts of profane writers and that in the book before us; it is only a recent discovery which has enabled us to reconcile them. Sir H. Rawlinson, in deciphering the inscription on a clay cylinder found in the temple of the moon at Mugheir, the ancient 'Ur of the Chaldees,' has been able, amongst other irrelevant matter, to make out that this Nabu-nahit had a son named Bilsharuzar, whom he admitted into a share of the government along with himself.[1] There can scarcely be a doubt then that this son is the Belshazzar of the Book of Daniel, for the variation is not greater than those which occur in the name of his father as given by Berosus, Abydenus, and others.[2] Thus we can understand how the two versions may be equally true; the son, Belshazzar, being left in charge of the city of Babylon—he is just the character that would be best left be-

Ptolemy he is Nabonadius; the Cuneiform inscriptions give the name as Nabunit, or Nabu-nahit, or Nabu-induk (see Rawlinson's Herod. vol. i. p. 427, note 9); Berosus as Nabonnedus, and Abydenus as Nabanidachus. All, however, are variations of the same name.

[1] This is a circumstance which has been referred to frequently by other writers. (See Rawlinson's Bamp. Lect. v. p. 134; also his Herodotus, vol. i. p. 431, 2nd ed.; Answers to Essays and Reviews, by J. N. Griffin, p. 297; and in the 'Athenæum' again, for March 18, 1854, by Rawlinson.) But it is so essential to more than one of the arguments furnished by this chapter that it is necessary to mention it here. That the practice of 'association' was general in those ages may be gathered from the royal monuments of Egypt recently brought to light. (See Rawlinson on the Pentateuch, in Aids to Faith, p. 255.)

[2] Compare the similar change of the Greek Neriglissar, from the Cuneiform Nergal-sharuzar; this name being derived from the god Nergal or Mars, as Belsharuzar is from Bel. (Rawlinson Herodotus, vol. i. p. 518, 2nd ed.)

Digitized by Google

hind—while the father Nabu-nahit went out to meet the foe; how too, by the chances of war, the one might be 'taken,' surprised in his drunken debauch, while the other was 'left;' and on this most likely supposition we can do away with a discrepancy which has tried the faith of ages. Yet how circuitous is the route by which we arrive at this result. It seems, however, most improbable that the version in the Book of Daniel would have assumed the form in which we there find it, if it were the production of one who wrote at a considerably later date than the time of the events he describes. Such an one, for the sake of his book's credibility, would have been careful to explain how it came to pass, that there existed a king Belshazzar in the reign of Nabu-nahit; nay if he wrote at, or just after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, which is the date assigned by those who deny the book's genuineness, it is more than probable that he would have been entirely ignorant of the fact; since Berosus, who wrote nearly a century earlier than that date,[1] and who, as one of the Chaldees and a priest of Bel, would have every opportunity of knowing what could be learnt at that time, still clearly knows nothing about it. But suppose the book to be the production of Daniel, and all is clear. He simply mentions (as is his wont), just so much as is necessary to his narrative, and no more. Familiar himself with the circumstances, and confident in the truth of what he states, he does not contemplate the difficulties and doubts which may occur to readers in distant ages, and so inadvertently leaves his narrative defective—yet only defective in a manner most natural to one writing at the time, or nearly so, of which he treats, and unnatural in the case of anyone else.

[1] He lived in the reign of Antiochus II. B.C. 261-246. Moses of Chorene calls him '*Vir Chaldaicus omnis doctrinæ peritissimus.*'

Digitized by Google

SECTION XXVIII.

The above explanations serve to throw light on other expressions found in this same chapter. In verse 7 it is stated that the reward promised to the successful interpreter of the writing on the wall was, that he should be 'clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and be the *third* ruler in the kingdom.' In the somewhat similar circumstance in the history of Joseph—of which some have declared this to be an imitation—it is stated that he (Joseph) was made *second* only to Pharaoh.[1] The same is also implied of Daniel himself in two other passages in this book; first where Nebuchadnezzar makes him 'ruler over the *whole* province, and chief of the governors *over all* the wise men:'[2] and secondly, when he was 'preferred above the presidents and princes . . . and the king (Darius), thought to set him over the whole realm.'[3] Now, how accurately correct does this expression '*third* ruler' prove to be, with the knowledge we now possess, that already there were two rulers, namely, Nabonadius and Belshazzar! Yet the expression would never have been used by a writer in a later age, who knew nothing of Belshazzar having had a share in the kingdom[4]—nay, even had he

[1] In Gen. xli. 40, Pharaoh speaks to Joseph thus:—'Thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall all my people be ruled (marg. 'be armed,' or 'kiss,' i.e. 'yield allegiance'); only in the throne will I be greater than thou.'

[2] Chap. ii. 48. [3] Chap. vi. 3.

[4] If he were imitating the history of Joseph, or if he were inventing the account, he would, as he has elsewhere, have placed Daniel *second* in the kingdom, 'preferred above the presidents and princes;' but in the present instance he is not above all the princes—for there is one, Belshazzar, still higher. The highest position to which—as

Digitized by Google

known it, which, as I have said, would not be likely, judging by the case of Berosus—even then, as he does not make any mention of Nabonadius, he would in all probability, directly or indirectly, have thrown in some remark which would afford an explanation. But suppose Daniel to be the author, and we then see here the unconscious accuracy of one who lives among the events he describes, and knows no version of them but the true one.

SECTION XXIX.

A similar touch of truth discloses itself in the mention made of 'the queen,' in verse 10 of this chapter:—'Now the queen came into the banquet house, and the queen spake,' &c. It is quite clear that this is not the wife of Belshazzar, since in verse 3 we are told that 'his wives and his concubines' were already at the banquet with him. But after what has been said above, we are in a position to assume, with the greatest probability of not being mistaken, that the person here mentioned was the rightful queen, the wife of Nabonadius. It is easy to see, that though it were quite natural for Daniel, writing at the time the events took place, to speak of her simply as 'the queen'—as indeed she was—without discovering the apparent contradiction to which he was committing himself (in vv. 3, 10), having in his account given no hint even as yet of the existence of any other king who could have a wife except Belshazzar, no such hint being necessary for the narrative; yet that one writing in a later age, and especially careful about

we find from other sources—he can be raised, is that of 'third ruler,' and to that the writer of this book describes him as advanced, though without even hinting as to the reason why. Here is, indeed, 'wheel within wheel,' but all in harmony.

Digitized by Google

his book's appearance, as wishing it to pass for the production of the age to which its subject matter belonged, would never have fallen into this apparent inaccuracy. He would not have used the expression 'the queen'—natural in Daniel from the force of habit—without specifying what particular queen he intended, especially when he had previously stated that the king's wives were already with him at the banquet.

SECTION XXX.

It is evident, I think, that at the time to which the events of this chapter belong, Daniel was no longer filling the post of distinction which he had held under Nebuchadnezzar. This has been accounted for[1] by a reference to the custom mentioned by Sir J. Chardin as still obtaining in Persia, of dismissing the royal astrologers and physicians on the death of a sovereign; the one because they have not predicted his death, the other because they have not prevented it. We have, however, no proof that any such custom prevailed in Babylon; and the matter may find an easy explanation on other grounds. We gather from other sources of information, sacred[2] or profane, that in all probability, between the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and that of Nabonadius, to which the events of the chapter before us belong, no less than three sovereigns had occupied the throne. It were

[1] See Barnes's Notes *in loc.*, where this explanation is quoted from Rosenmüller (Morgenland on Dan. v. 13), who himself takes it from Harmer.

[2] The only sacred information on this subject is to be found in 2 Kings, xxv. 27, when Evil-merodach, the son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned. But Berosus (ap. Joseph. cont. Ap. i. 20) and Abydenus (ap. Euseb. Chron. i. x. p. 28) give the names of all these kings, with only a slight variation in the spelling.

Digitized by Google

perhaps hardly to be expected, in any case, that the same individual should continue to hold so high a position as that which Daniel occupied, through five successive reigns. But in the present instance there are strong reasons for supposing that he would not. Nabonadius was an usurper, only ascending the throne as the nominee of a party which had put the previous sovereign to death. Now it is not likely that 'the Chaldæans' would escape the infection of this conspiracy, especially as they were among the leading instruments, on the occasion of a new sovereign, in establishing him on his throne.[1] They would in all probability be divided into factions; in which case Daniel, were he still of their body, would certainly not be found on the side of the usurper. And what more natural than that the successful competitor for the crown should reward with high-office his most strenuous partisans, to the supercession, perhaps, of others more fit for the duties and responsibilities of the charge, but who had not espoused his cause? while at the same time the moderation which, we may be sure, would characterise the conduct of Daniel on such an occasion, might pave the way for his admission to government employ of a more subordinate kind, such as he seems to have been now actually holding.[2] Taking, then, all things into consideration, we should not have expected to find Daniel now filling the offices which he had formerly held under Nebuchadnezzar. But what I am chiefly

[1] This is stated by Berosus, as cited by Josephus; cont. Ap. i. 19.

[2] See chap. viii. 27. Should it appear strange to anyone that Jews should thus, in so many instances as we find recorded, have accepted office without scruple under a heathen monarch, we have only to remember that it was the express advice and direction of the prophet Jeremiah (xxix. 7) to his captive brethren, that they should promote the peace of Babylon; and how could this be better effected than by supplying her government with wise and judicious officers?

Digitized by Google

concerned with is the indirect manner in which this comes out; which is natural enough if Daniel the prophet be the writer of the book, but on any other supposition[1] unnatural and improbable to the highest degree. Writing, as he would, at different and sometimes widely separated periods, the seeming discrepancies or contrasts which might appear in the distinct pieces of history contained in what are *now* successive chapters, would seldom or never occur to him; or, if they did, his habit (so often detected by us) of giving only so much as was absolutely necessary for the narrative in hand, coupled with the sense of independence arising from the consciousness of truth, would lead him to disregard them as of small importance indeed. But I can hardly conceive of a writer composing these chapters *in close succession*, as an impostor writing at a later date would do, and not making some explanatory observation, when in one chapter he represents the individual whom he is personating as second only to the sovereign of the land, and in the very next introduces him as an individual not known to the king, now reigning, even by name. *Some* explanatory remark, however short, he would have felt himself compelled, for the sake of his book's credibility, to throw into the narrative. And the absence of any such remark seems to me, the more I think of it, utterly incompatible with the supposition of such an one being the author. But, as I have said before, suppose that Daniel himself is the author, and then the difficulty at once vanishes; nay, not only so, but we then

[1] Both here and generally, I omit all reference to the supposition that the book might be written, not by Daniel, but by some one else living in his day; since not only would such an attempt be well nigh objectless, but the difficulty of personating Daniel in his own day would be so great as to justify our at once scouting the idea.

Digitized by Google

have what we might even, under the circumstances, expect.

SECTION XXXI.

In verses 2, 11, 13, 18, Nebuchadnezzar is designated the 'father' of Belshazzar, the marginal reading substituting 'grandfather.'[1] Yet it is not quite clear how this was, since his father Nabonadius, so far as we can make out from the little known of him, was not even of the family of Nebuchadnezzar at all.[2] The only solution of this which seems at all likely is founded on the conjecture[3] that Nabonadius married the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, 'the queen,' who appears in this chapter, and that so, through her, Belshazzar was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. This would seem the more probable from what is here said of the queen. She is evidently a person of influence: one, who in the midst of a drunken debauch can command the attention of all present, and speak with authority. Such would naturally be the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest sovereign of the dynasty to which he belonged. And further, she shows a knowledge of the events of his reign, and emphasises her mention of his actions, as a daughter

[1] The word 'father' is frequently used thus of a more distant relationship. Ex. gr. 2 Sam. ix. 7. Compare 1 Kings xix. 16 with 2 Kings ix. 2.

[2] Berosus (ap. Joseph. cont. Ap. i. 20) only says of him that he was a Babylonian belonging to the faction that conspired against the ruling sovereign Laboroso-archod; while Abydenus says that he was not a relation (ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. ix. 41).

[3] See Rawlinson's Bamp. Lect. v. note 41, p. 135, where such marriages are said to have been 'a part of the state policy of the time,' several other instances being given, besides the confirmatory circumstance that Nabonadius himself adopted the name of Nebuchadnezzar, and had a son so called.

Digitized by Google

proud of her father might be expected to do. This then is, in all probability, the true solution of the difficulty. But though the use of the word 'father,' in this laxer sense, is quite scriptural, and therefore not incorrect in the writer of this book, yet it is not at all likely that an impostor would have thus gone out of his way to cumber his book with an extra difficulty, in order to appear scriptural. Rather to show an accurate knowledge of the times such as he would think ought to characterise a book claiming to belong to those times, he would have most carefully eschewed such an expression, being, as it is, without corroboration in its most literal sense, and only to be explained in any way by conjectures. But if Daniel himself be the writer, and actually recording the language as it was spoken, regardless of appearances, as he only could afford to be, it is in *him*, and under such circumstances, natural enough.

SECTION XXXII.

There are traces of genuineness in what is said of the miraculous writing on the wall, in this, the fifth chapter. In ver. 8, the wise men are described as equally unable to decipher or interpret it: yet (in ver. 25) when Daniel reads it off, the words prove to belong to the Aramaic vernacular. How then, it might be asked, was it that they could not read their own language? An impostor anxious for his book's credibility, would never have left this unexplained, thus saddling his account with an unnecessary difficulty. But if Daniel were the writer, and only giving facts, with which he was himself acquainted, *he* might well leave the account to stand on the authority of his own assertion, without interlarding his narrative with explanations, which, from the notoriety

Digitized by Google

of the circumstances described, he would deem uncalled for. The inability of the wise men to decipher what was at once intelligible to him, might of course be accounted for by supposing the character of the writing to have been distinct from all human letters, and only legible by the aid of divine illumination. But without resorting to the miraculous where it is not distinctly predicated in the original, it is not difficult to find a solution arising from the nature of the modes of writing known to have existed at that time. There was a character in use among the Jews prior to the captivity, differing from the square Chaldæan letters which were adopted by them at that time and henceforward, though the older type still survived among the Samaritans. This Jewish writing would be very likely to be unknown to the Chaldæans,[1] though Daniel would of necessity be familiar with it; while as the style of writing employed by his people, and that which had, on the original stone tablets of the law, been consecrated by 'the finger of God' (Ex. xxxi. 18), it might well be thought likely that this should be the character the Almighty would make use of now, thereby appropriately identifying the author of the miracle, in the sight of all, with the true God of the Jews. That this would be one leading object in the miracle is clear from the connection in which it stands. At this particular feast Belshazzar was desecrating the vessels brought from the temple at Jerusalem; and

[1] In Ezra, ch. 4, the Samaritans, in writing a letter to Ahasuerus, are distinctly said to have used the Syrian, that is, Chaldæan, or Aramaic character (ver. 7). Even at this time, then, it would seem that the character employed generally in Samaria, *which was the old Hebrew mode of writing* prevalent before the captivity, was not yet known to, or at least not suited as a medium of communication with, Babylon. At an earlier date it would, of course, be still less likely to be understood.

Digitized by Google

the writing on the wall is expressly said to have appeared 'over against *the* candlestick,' which probably, as a part of the plunder of the temple, was there exhibited, as in a later age it appears on the arch of Titus in Rome. By the position then of the phenomenon the divine indignation was expressly indicated as aroused by the special guilt of the occasion, and the self-conviction of Belshazzar at this significant omen is apparent in his conduct. Yet had an impostor purposely devised this part of the account as an *imitation* of truth, he would have been sure to give a greater prominence to a feature so laboured, and not have left the explanation, as it is left, to conjecture; while, as we have stated above, it would accord well with the position and circumstances of Daniel.

SECTION XXXIII.

Modern research has not been attended with the same success in the removal of the difficulties connected with the mention of 'Darius the Mede' in this book, as in the singularly felicitous discovery which I have mentioned regarding Belshazzar. The Book of Daniel, in this respect, still, in appearance at least, is at variance with all other known accounts; and we can only attempt to reconcile the different versions by conjecture. The writer of the article on 'Darius' in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' seems to identify him with Astyages, the last king of the Medes,[1] while Rawlinson[2] rather thinks it probable that 'he was a viceroy set up by Cyrus, of whom there is at present no trace in pro-

[1] And see Herodotus, i. 73, 109, 127.

[2] Bamp. Lect. v. p. 135; see also note 46; and Rawl. Herod. vol. i. pp. 338, 339.

Digitized by Google

fane history.' The most generally received opinion has been that he was Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages, and uncle of Cyrus.[1] It is to be observed, too, that though in the Book of Daniel nothing explicit is stated on this point, yet the language employed is quite consistent with the supposition that he was the uncle of Darius, and nominated by him to the government of Babylon on his conquest of the kingdom.[2] But whatever the explanation of this difficulty—and time, it is to be hoped, will yet supply us with a decisive one—I do not see that this variation between the accounts of the book before us, and profane versions, militates at all against the book's genuineness, but rather the reverse. An impostor, writing at a later period, when he could consult the accounts of others, would have either followed their version, or at least have shown some plausible reason

[1] See Kitto's Bibl. Encycl., art. 'Darius;' Bertholdt, Comm. in Dan. pp. 843-858, or his arguments abridged in Barnes's Notes on Dan. Introd. to chap. vi. § ii.; and Prideaux's Conn. vol. i. pp. 120, 121.

[2] The expression by which he is introduced to our notice in this chapter (v. 31), 'Darius the Median *took* the kingdom,' in the Hebrew as in the English ('accepit regnum,' Buxtorf in voc. קִבֵּל), is equivalent to 'received' it, as from another; which is further confirmed by the language in chap. ix. 1, 'was *made* king over the realm of the Chaldæans;' where the original Hebrew distinctly means 'was *appointed* king.' While the reference in chap. vi. 8 to 'the law of the Medes *and Persians*,' as conjointly in operation during his reign, though he was a Mede, coupled with the interpretation of Daniel (chap. v. 28), 'thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes *and Persians*,' all go to confirm the idea that Darius was not entirely an independent sovereign. It should be noted too, as a circumstance which may have some significance as bearing on this subject, that, while in both the passages just quoted, the formula is 'the Medes and Persians,' in the book of Esther, under a known Persian sovereign, the latter have the precedence. It is not then 'the Medes and Persians,' but 'the Persians and Medes' (chap. i. 18, 19).

Digitized by Google

for not doing so. It is scarcely to be supposed that such a writer would have ventured to launch a book on the Jewish critical world, purporting to belong to the age of Daniel, and yet have made statements in that book apparently at variance with all that was known, from other sources, of the history of that time. In short, we can only account for the statements found here, on the supposition that the writer gives an *independent* version, such as would be given only by one who wrote at the time of the events; and that he reveals, as would be natural in such an one, a more accurate knowledge of the circumstances of which he treats than can be found in any later accounts.

SECTION XXXIV.

In the sixth chapter of this book, upon which we are now entering, I discover a consistency of detail, and a delicate appropriateness in the delineation of character and feelings, strongly confirmatory of the hypothesis that the writer deals in facts and draws his pictures from life. I would not lay an unfair stress upon any instance I may adduce; but from their evident undesignedness they have their value—the greater when they are taken in conjunction with all that has gone before.

The chapter begins with Daniel's elevation to a very high office, on the accession of Darius; no reason whatever being assigned for the appointment, except the general one that 'it pleased Darius.' We need not indeed be at any loss for reasons quite sufficient to account for this act of the king, and probably the true ones. For instance, it was natural that the sage whose last act, under the preceding dynasty, had been to foretell the success of this, should be among the first singled out

Digitized by Google

as recipients of the conqueror's favour.[1] It is also not unlikely that the fame of Daniel may, before this, have reached the ears of Darius; for some years prior to the present time, Ezekiel had spoken of his wisdom and goodness as proverbial, even, in one instance, in language addressed to the king of another country;[2] and the proclamation of Nebuchadnezzar, given in chap. iv., and in which Daniel is so highly spoken of, could scarcely yet have been forgotten. All, or any, of these reasons would be more than sufficient to induce, and account for, this act of Darius; yet they are none of them given by the writer of this book. Now, I argue, no impostor would have been thus silent. He would have known how improbable it would, at first sight, appear, that Darius should thus honour one who was, for anything stated to the contrary in the book, entirely a stranger to him, and further, actually in the service of those sovereigns whom he had just driven from their joint dominion; should honour him too, to the exclusion of his own officers, who would now be naturally looking for preferment, as the reward of their services in winning for him the crown. And accordingly, knowing all this, in order to give his book the appearance of credibility—about which, be it remembered, such an one would be especially solicitous—he would have been careful to add some explanation, however short, as to the *motives* which had led the king to adopt this mode of procedure. Yet not a hint of the kind is given. The statement is left to stand on its own merits, or on

[1] Compare the special commands given by Nebuchadnezzar in favour of the prophet Jeremiah (see Jer. xxxix. 11, 12); which are most probably to be accounted for by supposing a knowledge, on the part of the king, of the prophet's predictions of the success of his arms. (See Jer. xxv. 9; xxvii. 6, &c.)

[2] Ez. xiv. 14, 20; xxviii. 3.

Digitized by Google

the authority of the writer; which, though highly improbable in a pretender, is quite to be accounted for in Daniel.

SECTION XXXV.

In verse 5, we find the enemies of Daniel testifying to the excellence of his character thus:—'We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God.' Such is their acknowledgement; not indeed implying the probability of any violation, on *his* part, of 'the law of his God,' but the one only chance, on their part, of involving him in an offence against other law (as they subsequently succeeded in doing), through the very scrupulousness of his obedience to that higher 'law of his God.' We have then here, if it be true, the strongest testimony to the integrity and piety of Daniel—somewhat similar in nature to the evidence of Pilate to the innocence of the Saviour. His bitterest enemies, though *seeking* 'to find occasion against him,' with a malice thirsting for his blood, 'could find none occasion nor fault, forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him.' It may be objected here, that this is an *ex parte* statement, and only therefore to be accepted *cum grano*. On the contrary, I contend that we must accept it entirely, or not at all; nay, so inseparably is it interwoven with the rest of the circumstances detailed, that our non-acceptance of it, in its entirety, necessitates our rejection of the whole chapter. For unless Daniel's character were thus unassailable, there were no need for the circuitous mode adopted to entangle him in the offence. The very *elaborateness* of the scheme resorted to shows how difficult a matter it was to bring him in guilty; while the *nature* of the

Digitized by Google

scheme further shows the power of his enemies, who had influence enough to obtain the permission for such a proceeding from the king—therein also confirming the previous statement as to Daniel's own elevated position: for unless he had occupied some such position, he would not have incurred so great a storm of envy: while the results were of so widespread a consequence, that had the story been promulgated anywhere near the times of Daniel, and *not* accurately true, it would have encountered contradiction. Unless therefore the whole chapter be false, the character of Daniel *must* have been such as is here described. On the other hand, that this description is a true one is probable, from the testimony to be gathered from other quarters.[1] But if this part of the narrative be correct, why not the rest? The whole is of a kind most unlikely to have been invented; for not only the miraculous nature of the deliverance here recorded, but the minute harmony and interworking of the different parts, is such as could scarcely have been conceived, or brought about, except as a close recital of facts; nor would the difficulty have been much less for one, not inventing his accounts, but basing them on tradition. But allow the account to be that of Daniel himself, and we can then understand, in the unity of the whole, the evidence the narrative itself bears about it of its own truthfulness.

SECTION XXXVI.

In verse 13, we have a touch of the natural, too incidental to be designed, and therefore to be best accounted for by the supposition that the narrative is taken

[1] As in the passages of Ezekiel referred to in the last argument. See note 2, p. 111.

Digitized by Google

from facts. Having obtained the promulgation of the decree of Darius, and found Daniel disregarding it, his enemies proceed to lodge their complaint before the king: and how do they begin? 'That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O King, nor the decree that thou hast signed,' &c. Observe, there is no mention here of Daniel's position in the king's service, or of any of the merits for which he was so highly distinguished. Some might have complained that one so elevated in position should have despised the commands of the sovereign who had so highly honoured him. But I think the particular turn their language takes is much more in keeping with the present circumstances. Knowing the value set by the king on Daniel, they would naturally be careful to avoid any allusion which might remind him of the worth and position of the accused, or the loss he would sustain in the removal of such an one. Daniel, therefore, is with them only 'one of the children of the captivity;' a captive of that race whose subjection had cost the Babylonian sovereigns so much trouble. Yet had an impostor written the book, and given the language here this particular turn, as a delicate imitation of nature, he would have given it a more marked prominence, or at least in some way have betrayed his consciousness that this was a studied point in his story, as in that case it would have been. But here it falls into its place so simply and unobtrusively, that it could not have been designed by the writer *only* with a view to *effect;* while it is so appropriate and truthlike, that it confirms the supposition of the account being one of facts, and not the fiction of a later age or the forgery of a deceiver.

Digitized by Google

SECTION XXXVII.

When Daniel is brought to the lion's den, the king speaks to him thus:—(verse 16) 'Thy God, whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee.' At first sight, we might suppose this to have been intended as the language of comfort to Daniel. Yet, in adopting such an interpretation of the words, I think we should be missing their real drift and significance. I rather conceive that they are spoken by the king, in the vain endeavour to still the compunction of his own breast for having sacrificed a valued servant to caprice and injustice. The weakness of this sovereign appears, in the first instance, in his sanction of the extravagant decree, which claimed for him divine honours. And now in the reactionary distress, produced by the consequences of that first act of folly, he labours 'till the going down of the sun to deliver' Daniel. But he has tied his own hands;[1] the laws of the Medes and Persians alter not, and though a despot, he is in this case powerless. Accordingly, the law takes its course, and Daniel is consigned to the den of lions. That the words, above quoted as addressed to Daniel, were not the expression of any settled conviction of the king's mind, is clear from the anxiety he had just displayed to deliver Daniel. But very probably he had heard, if not from the lips of Daniel himself, yet from rumour, the miraculous circumstances which had previously taken place; and as drowning men catch at straws, so does he try to silence the voice of self-reproach by the dubious hope—to which he seeks to give

[1] For instances of a king's powerlessness to abrogate a decree, which seems to have been peculiar to Persian institutions, compare Herodotus iii. 31 ; ix. 11.

Digitized by Google

additional substance and reality by telling it aloud—that the God who has before so miraculously interposed for his servant's safety will do so again. That he still continued to have misgivings—the want of faith natural to such an one—appears in his subsequent conduct, his declining the usual entertainments of the table and music, his taking no rest, and the 'haste' with which, at early dawn, he repairs to the lions' den, to learn for himself the confirmation or failure of his hopes. Now, in all this, the vacillating character of the king, his conduct, his very words and thoughts, there is so complete a harmony—often indeed not pointed out expressly, as it probably would have been in the case of a forgery, but still perceptible in proportion as we examine the account, the very fact that it needs thus looking for increasing its value when found—as is scarcely consistent with any hypothesis, but that of the book being the work of an eye-witness of what it records. The writer is evidently one who aims at giving the truth without varnish or comment; and if this be his evident aim, why should we doubt him when he claims to be Daniel the prophet?

SECTION XXXVIII.

It has been observed,[1] that the variation in the character of the punishment described in this chapter (vi.) as compared with those mentioned in chapters ii. and iii.,[2] accords with the change of dynasty. Yet this is a coincidence scarcely likely to have occurred to a writer of a later day. The punishment described in this chapter is one still in vogue in Fez and Morocco;

[1] Horne's Introd., Ayre's ed. 1860, p. 844.

[2] Chap. ii. 5; iii. 6.

Digitized by Google

Jeremiah (xxix. 22) mentions two men (Zedekiah and Ahab) 'whom the king of Babylon roasted with fire,' so that this was evidently a Babylonian custom. The conversion of the offender's house into a dunghill was also, probably, a punishment peculiar to those regions; where the sun-burnt bricks would speedily crumble into a shapeless ruin when left to the action of the moist alluvial soil, for which the land was then remarkable.[1] The practice of cutting an offender's body to pieces was not peculiar to any one[2] nation. Now these several details, all in harmony with facts, and with each other, yet thrown in without the least connection, so as to preclude the possibility of design, surely serve to show that the writer is in every respect truthful; that not only does truth lie on the surface of what he states, but at the bottom as well.

SECTION XXXIX.

Lastly, there is in the decree at the close of this chapter so great a similarity of expression and sentiment to the decrees of chapters iii. and iv., as would bespeak a common author. This is especially evident on comparing it with the language in chap. iii. 29 and chap. iv. 34–37. Now the positions occupied by Daniel under Nebuchadnezzar and Darius are represented as having been substantially the same; what more natural than that his influence should have been similarly displayed? As chief counsellor to each of these kings, he would be likely to have a hand in the

[1] This would seem to be confirmed by the circumstance that this expression occurs nowhere in the Bible, except in the books of Daniel and Ezra. Here, again, is a coincidence not likely to have occurred to a writer at a later day.

[2] Compare 1 Sam. xv. 33.

Digitized by Google

drawing up of the decrees promulgated by each; especially in matters of this kind, and on these extraordinary occasions, it were to be expected that they would consult him and adopt the language he might suggest. And such, from the text itself, would appear to have been the case. Yet this coincidence is evidently undesigned, or it would have been more distinctly pointed out. It is not in the nature of falsehood to copy truth in these minutiæ; and therefore, as testimony, they are valuable in the inverse ratio to their own intrinsic importance as parts of the narrative.

We have now travelled through the *historic* portion of the book of Daniel, and have seen, in many instances in each chapter, that not only are the statements such as are consistent with the hypothesis of Daniel the prophet being its author, but such as, in many respects, would hardly have been made unless he were so. And this which we have found to hold good of its statements, we have discovered, to an equal degree, in its inadvertencies and omissions. So that alike in what the book records, and in what it fails to record, its genuineness is apparent. There are in this, as in every book occupied with such subjects, some difficulties; but their number becomes vastly increased if we consider it as the work of any but the author it claims for itself, the prophet Daniel.

SECTION XL.

To canvass at any length the evidence arising out of the contents of the latter half of this book regarded as prophecies, would be impossible within the limits of a work like the present, since it would involve a discussion of the whole question of their true interpretation and fulfilment; a subject which would supply the materials

Digitized by Google

for many volumes. I shall therefore confine myself to two general arguments based upon their prophetic character, and then pass on to other and incidental matter, such as I have already drawn out from the historic portion of the book.

The first thing to be noticed is the entire harmony that exists, though under a great variety, in the symbols employed, between the latter visions (purporting so to be) of Daniel and the dream of Nebuchadnezzar as given in chap. ii.; as also between themselves respectively, when compared together.

The following is a skeleton sketch, collected mainly from the pages of Auberlen,[1] showing the natural relation of these dreams and visions to each other. Though confined to the barest outlines, it is yet, I think, amply sufficient to illustrate and confirm the particular argument I am here adducing.

In chap. ii., the four great kingdoms, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman, are symbolised by the different parts and materials of one large image.

In chap. vii., the same four great kingdoms are represented under the images of four beasts. Of the first of these four kingdoms but little is said beyond a bare mention of it. This, however, is easily accounted for; since from chap. ii. 8, we gather that it was, as I have said, the Babylonian empire, and therefore contemporary with the writer, and needing no lengthy description. The second and third are also briefly passed over; but then they are to be described at greater length elsewhere.[2] The fourth receives the chief notice in both chaps. (ii.

[1] Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenb. Johannis, Engl. Transl. published by Messrs. Clarke, Edinburgh.

[2] Viz. in chap. viii.

Digitized by Google

and vii.), and here the agreement is remarkable; while, at the same time, the latter of the two chapters, along with this agreement, also introduces additional details. In chap. ii., the political expansion of this kingdom is represented by the toes of the image: the instability of the different powers they symbolize being pointed out, but nothing more; it being added, in the interpretation of their meaning (ver. 44), that in the days of those kings, the God of heaven should set up a kingdom never to end, but to destroy and supersede all others.

In chap. vii., we find the ten horns of the fourth beast corresponding exactly to the probable number of the toes of the large image of chap. ii.; but we are carried a step farther in the prophecy, when from among tho e horns, there springs up 'another little horn,' before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots' (ver. 8). There is here no distinction corresponding to that between the iron and the clay of the toes of chap. ii., though the instability of the powers is still hinted at, by the rooting up of the three horns before the 'little horn.' Each chapter thus supplies an omission in the other; and then follows (vii. 27) a mention of the everlasting and universal kingdom, corresponding to that of chap. ii. (vv. 44, 45). Here with considerable variation, we have harmony and mutual elucidation.

Passing on to the other prophetic chapters of the book, we find the same characteristics apparent throughout.

As the visions of chaps. ii. and vii. were connected by an unity of subject, so are those of chaps. viii. and x.–xii.; chap. ix. intervening with an independent subject; still, however, bearing on what has gone before, as well as on what follows.

Digitized by Google

It has been remarked, that in chaps. ii. and vii., but little was said of the second and third of the four great kingdoms there foreshadowed. The vision of chap. viii. fills in what was there omitted, for it is devoted entirely to the description of these two kingdoms. Here, again, more attention is given to the third than to the second, which, however, were natural, if the divine communications were really made to *Daniel*, since he himself lived at least to see some of the early years of the Persian empire; and therefore the same reason which served to account for the brevity of the mention of the Babylonian kingdom, in chap. ii., would satisfactorily explain the fact of there being here no full description of the kingdom which succeeded it.[1] In this vision, the four-fold division of the Macedonian kingdom, under the successors

[1] It may be observed, too, that there is an agreement in the *manner* in which these several kingdoms are designated. That of Babylon is pointed out distinctly (ii. 38), when Daniel says to Nebuchadnezzar, 'Thou art this head of gold.' So also the Medo-Persian and Grecian (or Macedonian) kingdoms are expressly named (chap. viii. 20, 21). But the name of the fourth, the Roman, is nowhere given. Now Daniel was personally acquainted with the first two. The third was by no means unknown at Babylon; witness the evidence I have adduced in notes 1 and 3, p. 79, and note 1, p. 80. But since the Jews only first came into political contact with Rome in the time of Judas Maccabæus—when an alliance was formed by which they became *amici et socii* of the Roman people (Winer. Real-Lex. Römer)—in the time of Daniel this fourth kingdom was quite beyond the political horizon, and its name accordingly omitted. In like manner in chap. xi. 40-43, though Syria is evidently alluded to, it is not mentioned *by name*, being, as an independent kingdom, as much removed from the historical horizon of the seer at that time as Rome herself. Hence Auberlen deduces an argument for the antiquity of the book (pp. 53 and 60, Engl. Transl.); since, if the book belonged to a later date—say the time of the Maccabees—it would be difficult to find any reason for these omissions. As it is, they are natural enough.

Digitized by Google

of Alexander, is prefigured. And here the connection of the vision with the dreams of chaps. ii. and vii. is curious. As the description of the third kingdom, in chap. vii. developes that of chap ii.; so chap. viii. completes that of chap. vii. This fourfold division does not appear at all in chap. ii.; it does in chap. vii., in the four wings of the leopard (ver. 6), and still more fully in chap. viii., in the four horns that rise up in the place of the one great horn, in evident allusion to Alexander and his successors. The pre-eminence of Antiochus Epiphanes is next prefigured, in the little horn which came forth from one of these 'four notable' ones, and subsequently 'waxed great.' The whole description here is a parallel to and receives light from the antichrist of chap. vii., symboled in the 'little horn' of that chapter, which rises up among the ten horns of the fourth beast, corresponding to the toes of the image in chap. ii. Thus do these different passages depend on and mutually illumine each other.

To proceed to chap. ix. We are here on fresh ground, yet, as I have said, still bearing on what has gone before, and preparing for what follows. It relates to the coming of the Messiah, and is a parallel to the Messianic portions of chaps. ii. and vii., and rectifies any false impression which might have been formed from the brief allusions occurring there. For whereas chaps. ii. and vii. conjointly represent the Messiah as setting up a kingdom over the world, at the head of His people; chap. ix. reveals to us that he is first to be 'cut off' (ver. 26). Thus is Christ's twofold character brought out. He is to die as the Redeemer, as we learn from chap. ix.; to rule as the head of His body the eternal church, as hinted at in chaps. ii. and vii.; and while chap. vii. expressly dwells upon the second coming of Christ in glory, and

Digitized by Google

the restoration of His saints to happiness along with it, chap. ix. introduces that other and earlier Messianic epoch, when Christ should be rejected by His people, and they, in consequence, rejected by Him.[1]

We now pass on to the concluding vision of the book. The details of chap. viii. are further developed in the final vision found in chaps. x.–xii. The vision itself is almost confined to chap. xi.; chap. x. standing as a prologue, chap. xii. as an epilogue. And the vision in chap. xi. is divided into three parts:—(1) From vv. 2–4, we have further details belonging to the Persian and Macedonian kingdoms; thus introducing a still further and final explanation of what had already reached various stages of developement respectively in chaps. ii. vii. and viii. (2) From vv. 5–20, we have a sketch of important events under the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, the kings of Egypt and Syria, whose contiguous position to Judæa gave them an immense influence over her for good or evil. And (3) From vv. 21–45, we get a detailed picture of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, a still further developement of the history of the 'little horn' of chap. viii. 9. In chap. xii. there is, in vv. 6, 7, an additional though mysterious gleam of light thrown on the date of the times of antichrist referred to in chap. vii. 25; as there is also in verse 11, on the date of the

[1] A further evidence that this book forms an integral part of divine revelation, interlacing with other inspired productions, and as necessary to them as they to it, is to be found in the fact that, while the period of time intervening between these two Messianic epochs is left in considerable obscurity by the book of Daniel, owing to his Israelitish and Old Testament stand-point, it is this very period which is especially dwelt upon by the Apocalypse of St. John; as though the spirit of inspiration would fill up by the one servant what he had left a blank or obscurity in His communications to the other. See Auberlen, pp. 140, 141.

Digitized by Google

desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes referred to in chap. viii. 11, 13.

Thus strangely do these different visions serve to develope the original ground plan of chap. ii.; and, while so doing, also elucidate each other. In these later chapters there is a considerable amplification of that first revelation, future events being in some instances detailed with very great minuteness; yet not a single expression is employed from first to last which mars the harmony. The visions of Daniel, while adding to, and illustrating that of Nebuchadnezzar, yet in no respect contradict it; rather their variations all serve to fill up blanks in the previous sketch, and to give an increased '*finish*,'[1] to the whole revelation. And this comes out the more, the more we examine and compare them.[2] Now the difficulty which anyone must encounter (supposing such a case), who attempted to invent these descriptions, in the endeavour to make them all agree, especially when we consider the variety of the emblems employed, and the frequent minuteness of detail, would be so great, that the actual accomplishment of such an undertaking without leaving some indications of the fraud, is scarcely conceivable. The complete agreement,

[1] See Chandler's Vindication of Daniel, where he discusses the visions of chaps. ii. vii. and ix.

[2] Besides the mutual support which the prophecies of this book afford each other, and which, therefore, indicates most forcibly their unity and connection, there is also observable a gradual progress in the *mode of the divine communication*, which is far too incidental to have been the artifice of a pretender, and yet is marked enough to have been a part of the divine plan. In chaps. ii. and iv. Daniel is simply the interpreter of the dreams of another; in chap. vii. he has himself a vision in a dream of the night; in chap. viii. the vision appears, apparently, while he is awake; in chaps. ix. x.-xii. the angels of God converse with him face to face, and in the common language of men. See Auberlen, pp. 32, 83, 84, 89.

Digitized by Google

therefore, in these separate descriptions, furnishes us with an argument for their divine origin, strong in proportion as we acknowledge the difficulty of their production by man. I think the above attempt to delineate the marvellous manner in which they interlap and mutually enlighten and sustain each other, incomplete as it necessarily must be when limited to so narrow a compass, is yet amply sufficient to convince any candid mind, that we have here not the *disjecta membra* of an imitator or impostor, but the *spirantia marmora* of the Great Master and Maker of all things—that God, in short, is here speaking by and to one of His own divinely appointed and illumined Prophets. Yet can we imagine the recipient of such divine communications stooping to the falsehood of professing to be what he is not, and blending that profession with the delivery of his inspired messages? In other words, admit the inspiration of the chapters, and the author of the book must be Daniel.

SECTION XLI.

In the next place, it is a fact worth noting, that the accordance of these (professedly) prophecies with real events of history,[1] appeared even so far back as the age of Porphyry,[2] great enough to favour the hostile supposition that they must have been composed after the events of which they treat had actually come to pass.[3]

[1] For accounts of the fulfilment of the prophecies of this book, so far as they are yet fulfilled, and of their wonderful accuracy as compared with history, I may refer to the works of Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, Mr. Faber, and Dr. Hales.

[2] Born A.D. 233.

[3] This objection has been recently reproduced by the reviewer of Bunsen's Biblical Researches, in the too well-known publication

Digitized by Google

Now this circumstance itself serves to place their truth in the strongest light. The objection indeed, so far as its antagonistic force is concerned, defeats itself; since, like the shifting sands in nature, it must ever be changing its ground, and proving its own baselessness, as the fulfilment of the prophecies themselves advances. The same feature in the book which, in the opinion of Porphyry, justified him in ascribing its composition to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, might, with equal reason, be regarded as bringing it down to the commencement of the Christian era; the language being not more explicit with reference to the former period than to the latter.[1] While therefore the utter hollowness and failure of any such argument *against* the genuineness of the book is transparent; we may still accept it for what it is worth, as the admission of an enemy to the truth of these representations, as compared with the actual facts of history; and the truthfulness of the book, in this instance, involves its genuineness as well.

SECTION XLII.

I now proceed to the traces of genuineness, which discover themselves in these chapters, distinct in the main from that which arises out of their fulfilment as prophecies. This, I am aware, is a limitation which greatly lessens the amount of evidence which *might* be

entitled Essays and Reviews, p. 69. But indeed it is the common allegation of all opponents of the book's genuineness.

[1] Chandler, in the preface to his Vindication of Daniel, says—'There is such a strange agreement between the one and the other (i.e. the language of Daniel, and the coming and mission of Christ) as must necessarily induce any considerate person to believe, *either that Daniel's book was written after the times of Jesus, or that Daniel's predictions related to and were fulfilled in Him.*'

Digitized by Google

adduced; since I thus deprive myself of all the arguments to be derived from the agreement existing between the foreshadowings of events, found in these chapters, and the history of events as they actually took place, to be found elsewhere;—an agreement which goes to show that the Great Over-ruler of all things and the Source of these prophecies were one and the same Being, and, consequently, to confirm the truth of the writer's claim to be a prophet. Yet it seems better to omit altogether the testimony of this nature, than to enter into it partially, as would only be possible in a work like the present, and therefore in a manner which would not do it justice.

The language in chap. vii. 1, cannot, I think, be understood as anything but an assertion that the writer is Daniel the prophet;[1] and the occurrence of this assertion in this particular place is not without its importance. Hitherto the writer of the book has spoken of Daniel in the *third* person only. In chapter viii., and to the end of the book, with one exception,[2] he writes in the first person, openly claiming to be himself Daniel; while in this intermediate chapter (vii.), he seems, as it were, to have reached the point of equilibrium between the two styles of writing. Commencing the chapter in the third person, yet at the same time asserting his authorship, he subsequently (beginning with verse 2) adopts the first, which (with

[1] Compare Isa. i. 1; ii. 1; Jer. i. 1; xxix. 1; xlv. 1; Ezek. i. 3; and the expression frequently occurring in Thucydides, *τῷδε πολεμῷ, ὃν Θουκυδίδης ξυνέγραψεν*, where he asserts his own authorship, though speaking of himself in the third person. Thucydides, ii. 70, *et alibi.*

[2] Chap. x. 1.

Digitized by Google

the exception above named) he continues to the end. Now, had the whole Chaldee portion of the book[1] been silent as to its author—as it hitherto has been—and had no expression of this kind occurred till the resumption of the Hebrew language in the next chapter, there might have been, in that case, some apparent ground for supposing the two parts to have been the production of different men; but as it is, we have, in this seventh chapter, a couple, linking together what has gone before with what is to follow. Connected with the five preceding chapters by the language in which it is composed, and with the five following by the assertion of its authorship, it thus binds together the whole as one work. Now, all this is perfectly natural if Daniel really be the author. In the historic portion of the book, taken, no doubt, in the main, from public documents[2]—themselves probably drawn up by Daniel, or under his supervision—he speaks of himself in the third person, in which manner alone he would be mentioned in those documents, and the style being also appropriate to the subject matter then in hand;[3] but when he comes to the narration of these events, belonging rather to his own *private* history and experience, he then naturally changes to the first person; the transition, however, being relieved of all abruptness by the interposition of this expression at the beginning of the seventh chapter, which partakes neither of the total silence, as to their

[1] It is to be remembered that the Chaldee began with chap. ii. 4, and ends with the close of this chapter, when the Hebrew is resumed.

[2] Except in the case of the prefatory chap. i., which was probably prefixed by the author at a later date, and adapted, in this respect, to the style of the chapters immediately following.

[3] See what is said on this head in § ii. pp. 37–8.

Digitized by Google

authorship, of the previous chapters, nor of the open acknowledgement of it which characterises the rest. Yet surely, in all this, there is a symmetry of so artless a kind, as would be beyond the skill of an impostor to conceive or imitate; and, therefore, such as should strongly confirm our belief in the simple truthfulness of the book and its statements, not excepting its claim to be the work of Daniel.[1]

SECTION XLIII.

The peculiar forms of the symbolical figures described in this (seventh) chapter, would favour the idea that the writer was familiar with Assyrian (or Babylonian) sculpture. The winged lion or bull, and the eagle-headed figure, partly human, are so peculiarly of that type, that Layard says, with reference to the visions of this chapter, as well as to some in Ezekiel, that 'these coincidences are too marked not to deserve notice, and do certainly lead to the inference that the symbols chosen by the prophet were derived from the Assyrian sculpture.'[2] Now, had the book been written by a Jew

[1] Throughout my examination of the preceding six chapters, I have always assumed that they claimed Daniel as their author; for although in no one place is this stated in those chapters, yet is the whole so closely connected together, both by the links I have here pointed out, and by others which will appear as we proceed, that what *is* distinctly stated in these later chapters, in this respect, I have regarded generally as belonging to the whole. The opinion that the book is not the production of one writer, though maintained by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, has been latterly abandoned as untenable by De Wette (Einleit. § 256) and Hitzig (§ 4); while Keil (Einleit. § 134, p. 443) points out a number of parallelisms which serve to connect the different parts of the book together as one. See also Hengstenberg (Authenticity of Daniel), p. 7, Engl. Transl.

[2] Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. p. 465.

Digitized by Google

residing at Jerusalem, and at a considerably later date,[1] it is scarcely likely that he would have had any intimate knowledge of this kind, or, if he had, would have displayed it here; unless, indeed, he did so expressly in order to give his book the appearance of having been written in Assyria; in which case, he would have been almost sure to copy very closely the representations he would find in Ezekiel, as the only models of the kind with which he would be likely to be familiar. Yet the figures described here differ too much from those of Ezekiel to admit of the supposition that they are copies, though still sufficiently like them in character to show a common influence, and to refer the production of the book to the same region. Since then the visions of Ezekiel, to which the above quotation refers, were composed in Babylonia,[2] we have, in this respect, strong internal evidence that the visions of Daniel belong to Babylonia as well, or, in other words, that the representations of the book itself are true.

SECTION XLIV.

There are two expressions occurring in this (seventh) chapter, which furnish us with an argument for the genuineness of the book, of a nature I have noticed before. The first of these is the title, 'the Ancient of Days,' found only in verses 9, 13, 22, of this chapter, and evidently applied to God; the second is the expression 'the Son of man,' in ver. 13, which, though nowhere else in the Old Testament used in such a sense,

[1] This was the idea of Porphyry, given by Jerome (Pref. and Explan. in Daniel); and since then of De Wette (Lehrbuch, p. 390), and of several others.

[2] In the Land of the Chaldeans, chap. i. 3; x. 20.

Digitized by Google

both the context and concurrent testimony of every age[1] require that we should understand, as here referring to the Messiah. Now it is most improbable that an impostor would thus have invented titles for God and Christ. Anxious, as he would be, to give his book a scriptural appearance, the very fact of their not occurring in the acknowledged Scriptures of his day, would at once have led him to reject them, had they occurred to his mind at all.

But if Daniel be the author of the book, *he* would write 'as one having authority,' and not as a slavish imitator of the true; writing too, as he would, in all the strength of conscious inspiration, we should not be surprised to find him thus showing his independence by the language he employs.

SECTION XLV.

The date of the eighth chapter, like that of the seventh, is fixed by the 'year of the reign of king Belshazzar,' to which it belongs. It has been already stated, that it appears from recent discoveries among the records of ancient Babylon, that Belshazzar, though king, was only so, as being admitted to a share in the government by his father Nabonadius. Why then does not the writer of this book date, in this chapter and elsewhere, by the years of the reign of Nabonadius,

[1] Porphyry, indeed, took this expression as applying to Judas Maccabæus; Grotius referred it to the Roman people; Aben Ezra to the people of Israel; and Cocceius to the people of the Most High. But Christ applied it to Himself, as He also did the phrases which accompany it (compare Matt. xxiv. 30; xxvi. 64; Mark xiii. 26; xiv. 62); and in this sense, with the above exceptions, it has been universally understood. (See Gill, Comm. *in loc.*)

Digitized by Google

rather than by those of his son's reign? We have here certainly a departure from what is customary; though the reasons for it can only be a matter of conjecture. Possibly, having in ch. v. only mentioned Belshazzar, the circumstances there related not necessitating any reference to Nabonadius, he may have thought it more simple and uniform to speak only of Belshazzar throughout. But in all probability this chapter—the events belonging to the third year of Belshazzar's reign—was written long before the events recorded in ch. v. took place; and therefore some other reason must be sought for. Perhaps as the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, through his mother the Queen,[1] Belshazzar may have really possessed a higher *status* in the country than his father who was only a usurper, and of less elevated birth. Be this however as it may; the matter would not have been left thus in obscurity by an impostor. For the sake of his book's credibility, he would have been careful to make it accord with the facts of history as given by others. As I observed, while treating of ch. v., it is very probable that such an one would not even be aware that a king Belshazzar had existed; but had he studied history at all—as such an one would be careful to do—he would certainly have known that the last king of Babylon was Nabonadius, and therefore would have dated by the years of *his* reign, not of his son's. Daniel, however, writing at the time of the events, and conscious of no desire to deceive, might for the sake of uniformity, or other reason, name only the

[1] Rawlinson (Bamp. Lect. V. p. 135, and note 41) conjectures that Nabonadius may have married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, with the politic design of strengthening himself in the government. The influence possessed by the Queen-mother is evident even in the little that is related of her in this book. See § xxxi. p. 105.

Digitized by Google

one king throughout his reference to events of that reign, a reference to the other not being absolutely needed, and therefore, in his sight, superfluous. At all events, we have here, very plainly, the language of one who writes on his own authority, and independently of others, which an impostor would not have done; and very possibly modern researches, which have cleared away other difficulties, may yet discover that, even in this apparent departure from custom, the writer reveals a knowledge of the circumstances of the times such as could only be possessed by a contemporary.

SECTION XLVI.

In verse 2, of ch. viii, Daniel states that in his vision, either actually or apparently, he was 'at Shushan in the palace,' or more correctly, 'Shushan the palace' (compare Esth. i. 2). An argument against the genuineness of the book has been raised,[1] on this expression, on the grounds, firstly, that the palace was built at this place by Darius Hystaspes, and therefore did not exist in the times of Belshazzar; secondly, that the name of Shushan was not given until long after the reign of Darius. The first of these two assertions is made on the authority of Pliny.[2] It is, however, as is observed by Horne,[3] contradicted by all Greek and oriental writers, who represent 'the place as extremely ancient.' The second statement is entirely overthrown by the fact that in an inscription, discovered by

[1] By Bertholdt, Griesinger, De Wette, &c.; cited by Hengstenberg (Authenticity of Daniel, p. 34, Engl. Transl.).

[2] Hist. Nat. lib. vi. 27.

[3] Introduction to O. T., section vi. on Daniel, p. 849, Ayre's ed. 1860.

Digitized by Google

Layard,[1] the name Shushan is found, spelt just as Daniel gives it here.[2] Thus we have one of the very passages adduced by others as an evidence of the writer's inaccuracy and ignorance of the times of the prophet Daniel, rather proving the reverse.

The circumstantial manner, too, in which it is specified *where* the scene of this vision lay, is such as we should have hardly found had the book been a forgery. In the previous chapter no locality is named as that in which the vision occurred; nor again in ch. ix. is it stated where the events there recorded took place. Now I think that no impostor would have written thus carefully about the locality, except with a design, and that his design would have been apparent. It is, indeed, said by some[3] that Daniel was at Shushan only 'in a vision,' and not actually; and that the scene of his vision was apparently there, 'because that place was to be the capital of the empire whose fortunes he foresaw.' Whether this were so or not, we have now no means of deciding with certainty; but if an impostor had written this chapter, and specified that particular locality, with this idea, he would have been sure to give it a greater degree of prominence. While the circumstantial manner in which the statement is here made, is what we might expect, if the account be that of Daniel himself; and the absence of all explanation accords exactly with his general practice

[1] Babylon and Nineveh, vol. ii. p. 453.

[2] The Susanchites are named in the letter of Rehum to King Artaxerxes (Ezra iv. 9) in a manner that implies the name to have been as well known as that of the Elamites, the Babylonians, &c.; which could hardly be the case were it of recent introduction.

[3] Horne's Introduction, Ayre's edition, § vi. p. 849. Hengstenberg also adopts this view; see 'Authenticity of Daniel,' p. 35; where he cites several others who have been of the same opinion.

Digitized by Google

of only saying just so much as he deems absolutely necessary, and then leaving his statements to stand on the merit of their own, or his authority.

SECTION XLVII.

The word rendered in our version 'goat,'[1] and occurring in verses 5, 8, and 21, of this chapter (viii.) is nowhere else to be found in the Bible, excepting in one place in the second Book of Chronicles.[2] Now as the constant tradition of the Jews, which has also been adopted by the great majority of Christian commentators, is that the Books of Chronicles were, in the main, the compilation of Ezra,[3] we get here an argument, serving to fix with no slight degree of probability the date of the Book of Daniel. The word here used seems to have been unknown to the Hebrews till the time of the Captivity. It occurs in only two books of Scripture viz. in the one before us, and in another written or compiled by Ezra.[4] Does not this look as if the two writers belonged to about the same period? But from the *manner* in which the writer here employs it, as compared with Ezra's use of it, we should further infer that the Book of Daniel slightly preceded, in point of time, the compilation of the Chronicles. For while in the latter book the word is used without gloss or comment, as one with which its readers would be familiar,

[1] It is צָפִיר, tzah-pheer. The usual term is עֵז, ngehz, which occurs upwards of seventy times; or תַּיִשׁ, tah-gish, which is found in four places.

[2] Ch. xxix. 21.

[3] See Smith's Dict. of Bible, Art. 'Chronicles.'

[4] The plural of the word, צְפִירֵי, occurs in Ezra vi. 17, and viii. 35; the first passage being in the Chaldee portion of the book, and the word therefore no doubt a Chaldee word.

Digitized by Google

in one of these passages in the Book of Daniel the writer adds a word to it by way of explanation,[1] thereby at least suggesting the inference, that the use of the word had not yet become so general as its use in the other author would imply. And this serves to bring the date of the book's production nearer still to the times of Daniel the prophet. In his day, when Chaldee was only first becoming familiar to the Jewish ear, such an addition was natural enough; by the time when Ezra wrote, it had entirely ceased to be needed. An impostor, therefore, writing later still, would have employed the word without the thought of making any such addition ever occurring to him at all.

SECTION XLVIII.

In the 16th verse of this chapter (viii), we have the first instance in this book of an Angel of God being designated by a particular name. I seize this opportunity, therefore, of briefly considering the subject of the angelology of the Book of Daniel, so far as it affects my present argument.

Objections have been brought against the book, on the ground that its representations of the angels are borrowed from the mythological doctrine of the Amschaspands of Ormuzd.[2] Strauss[3] says they are evidently due 'to the influence of the Zendic religion,' and in

[1] This occurs in v. 21. The additional word is הַשָּׂעִיר; which is added, says Bishop Patrick (see Comm. on 2nd Book of Chronicles, xxix. 21), just as in the New Testament we have ὁ πατὴρ added to the Ἀββᾶ, in Mark xiv. 36; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6.

[2] Bertholdt on Daniel, p. 528. The same view is maintained by De Wette.

[3] Vol. i. p. 129.

Digitized by Google

support of this he adduces the assertion of a Rabbinical writer, that the Jewish names of the angels came with the Jews from Babylon.[1] This, however, amounts to nothing more than what every reader of Scripture must be aware of; namely, that the period of the Babylonish captivity was the date at which commenced the custom of designating the angels by name in a manner which we do not find to have obtained before. But this is far from implying what modern objectors to the book would make of it; and indeed the baselessness of the assumption founded upon it is now admitted.[2] So far then the assault from this point is withdrawn; but the ground abandoned by the enemy may, I think, be occupied by ourselves with advantage, and we shall see that this feature of the book rather serves to connect it, in a not unnatural manner, with the circumstances under which it professes to have been written, and so is a confirmation of its truthfulness, and therein of its genuineness as well, which its truthfulness involves.

[1] The passage is found in the Jerusalem Talmud—quoted by Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. et Talmud. in Evang. Lucæ, p. 492, ed. Leusden, and runs as follows:—'R. Simeon, son of Lachish, says that the names of the angels, in the land of Israel, *ascended from Babylon*. For before it had been simply said (Is. vi.), one of the "Seraphim flew to me," "the Seraphim stood before him," &c.; but afterwards "the man *Gabriel*" (Dan. ix. 21), and "*Michael* your prince" (Dan. x. 21).'

[2] Nitzsch, in his 'Academical Lectures,' cited by Rev. H. I. Rose in 'Replies to "Essays and Reviews,"' p. 78, allows that it cannot any longer be maintained that the demonology and angelology of the Jews was learned at Babylon. Dr. Mill (on the Historical Character of Luke, i. pp. 57–60) shews that neither in the names themselves here given to the angels, is there any trace of such an origin, since they are of the purest Hebrew; nor is there sufficient resemblance, in other respects, between the angels of Daniel, or Zechariah, and the Amschaspands of the magian system, to warrant any such conclusion, as that the former were derived from the latter.

Digitized by Google

It is a part of divine economy to unfold its doctrines by degrees. This is discoverable in the Scripture treatment of many subjects. For instance the early announcements with regard to the scheme of redemption were not so distinct in detail as those of subsequent times. The same is true of the doctrine of the Trinity, that of the Resurrection, and others.[1] A graduated scale is perceptible in the teaching of our Saviour. Witness his words:—'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*.'[2] In like manner, the revelations of Scripture with regard to the heavenly hosts are *progressive*. This is clearly put by the writer of the article on 'Angels' in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible;' where it appears (i.) that the representations on this subject vary in different books, the reasons for which variation he discovers in the different scope to be attributed to the books themselves; and (ii.) that as times and circumstances change, so are the angelic

[1] Auberlen (on Dan., Appendix, § 8, pp. 434–5) gives a chapter from the 'Interpretation of Daniel by M. F. Roos,' in which he points out the different language employed, in different ages or circumstances, in the scriptural references to the future Messiah:

1. During the patriarchal times when men lived in families rather than communities, He is called the *Seed*.

2. At a time when the wickedness of the earth was great, Enoch spoke of His coming as a *Judge*.

3. Jacob, foretelling the future occupation of Canaan, by his descendants, calls the Redeemer *Shiloh*, or Prince of Peace.

4. When the Davidic kingdom was flourishing, He was spoken of as a *King*, with allusions to his priesthood.

5. Prophets under the kings called Him a *King*.

6. Those later call Him the *Shepherd*, the Anointed One, Angel, Zemach.

[2] John xvi. 12. Compare also Matt. xvi. 21, which marks a turning point in the teaching of Christ. Hitherto, His great object had been to prove to His disciples His divinity: now He begins to tell more plainly that, though divine, He was to suffer and die.

Digitized by Google

ministrations regarded in different aspects; the appropriateness of those variations, however, being discoverable throughout. When, for instance, Scripture is dealing with Abraham and his household as a *chosen family*, the angels are described as mingling with, and watching over, *family* life.[1] When we approach the history of God's chosen *nation*, they appear to be employed more as the messengers of a sovereign to his people,[2] in a *public* capacity. In the New Testament, we find them engaged, first, in the service of Christ, to proclaim His birth, resurrection, ascension, &c; and, secondly, after His withdrawal from earth, their ministrations are, in some sort, extended to His individual human members. They are 'ministering spirits' to 'the heirs of salvation;' and Christ's 'little ones' have their angels, who 'always behold the face of "His" Father in heaven.' They are interested in the Gospel scheme, and rejoice over individual repentance.[3] Now the appropriateness evident in all this, and which goes to prove that the divine revelations on this subject were systematically dealt out, in a manner and degree according with the circumstances and exigencies of God's people at the different periods to which they belong, is no less apparent in the representations of the angels found in the Book of Daniel. The revelations (purporting so to be) there made, are at that particular stage which accords with the position of the Jews at the time to which the book professes to belong. There is indeed nothing in the book of which the *germ* at least may not be found in earlier parts of Scripture;[4] but there is a

[1] See Gen. xviii. xix.; xxiv. 7-10; xxviii. 12; xxxii. 1, &c.
[2] Josh. v. 15; Jud. ii. 1, 4; vi. 2; xiii. 3.
[3] Heb. i. 14; Matt. xviii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12; Luke xv. 7.
[4] 'There is nothing,' says Dr. Mill (on the Historical Character of

Digitized by Google

greater prominence given to some of its features than has hitherto been observable, those features, however, being the very ones which we might expect to be especially dwelt upon at that particular time.

Let us see how this appears. We have before noticed the effects of association, in the resemblance between the imagery of some of the visions in this book and the character of the Assyrian or Babylonian sculpture and architecture. In the feature of the book now under consideration, I think we have traces of a corresponding influence, though in a different sense to that in which opponents would understand it—arising from the religious notions which the writer would continually encounter if he were the Daniel of the book and circumstanced as Daniel is there represented to have been. It is not that the writer of the book engrafts any part of the false system of the heathen on the true Jewish creed, but that he speaks of the true in a manner and phraseology induced by his position among the worshippers of the false. But in doing so, he does not in the least compromise the character of his faith; rather, he thus the more advantageously contrasts it with others. Writing for his countrymen, who were captives in a land where tutelary beings were believed to preside over every phase of nature, and national or individual existence, he shows them that neither in these respects is their own religion wanting; that for them a truer and mightier agency is at work; that over

Luke, i. p. 54), 'in Daniel, respecting even the command of these (heavenly) hosts, and the championship of Israel assigned to their leader, of which we have not the actual substance, in the books of Moses and Joshua.'

The naming of the angels, it is to be observed, is not entirely without precedent, since Satan had long ago been so designated. See Job. i. 6; ii. 1, 12; Ps. cix. 6.

Digitized by Google

them too there are higher intelligences appointed as the guardians of their welfare; that though torn from their home, and blotted out from their place as a nation, they are still not forgotten, for that Michael, 'one of the chief Princes' of heaven, stands before God on their behalf (Dan. xii. 1). And thus, as the wisdom of God had, in Jer. x. 11, supplied them with a protest ready framed in Chaldæan speech, which they might address to believers in the Sabian creed, among whom they were sojourning, so here he would seem to be affording an additional insight into His dispensations for their protection, that, by the very knowledge, they might be the more encouraged to withstand the subtleties of the Magianism,[1] to which they would be more than ordinarily exposed.

Now all this accords well with the position of the writer, if he be the Daniel described in the book, and the book, therefore, true; for it is then just what would be called for by the exigencies of the Jewish people at the time; but if the writer were an impostor, it is not at all likely that it would have occurred to him to attempt so clever an artifice—and as such only would he have used it—in imitation of truth; and even if it had, there are still other reasons, which would be of great weight with such an one, which would have been certain to deter him from the attempt.

Again, it is not improbable that there may have been remnants of original truth blended with, and preserved in the mythological systems of Babylon,[2] as they would

[1] The very name of Michael—Quis sic ut Deus—itself would seem to embody a protest against every other religion but that of the true God. Mill, *loc. cit.* p. 57, note 9.

[2] The Semitic theism, before the introduction of idolatry, must have been very nearly identical with the religion of Abraham;

Digitized by Google

also be retained, in the form of oral tradition, among the Jews. And the position occupied by Daniel, if this book be true, was that which was most calculated to render him acquainted with all this,[1] and what more natural than that in writing for the use of the one nation, and in the heart of the other, he should give a prominence to the truths possessed by both. While then it should not be forgotten, that this is not the first occasion on which the angels are mentioned by name, since Satan had long before been so designated, and that it cannot be proved that these angels were not known, if not by name, yet by office, traditionally among the Jews, even before this time, since in the Book of Joshua (v. 15) an angel of very exalted rank is spoken of as 'the captain' (or Prince) of 'the hosts of the Lord,' which has been generally identified with the Michael of this book,[2]—yet allowing that these particular names do certainly first occur in Scripture at this period, it still seems quite natural that, as an accommodation to human ideas,—and much of the phraseology connected with angels undeniably is such, these heavenly beings might be spoken of, in a manner not before usual, since the ideas of the persons for whom the book was written

while magianism was the purest of all heathen systems.—See De Pressense, 'The Religions before Christ,' pp. 35–44, English transl. 1862, and also Hardwick's 'Christ and other Masters,' part iv. ch. iii.

[1] The writer of the article on 'Daniel,' in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, says, by the position he occupied, 'Daniel was enabled to preserve whatever was true in the traditional teaching of the East, and to cast his revelations into a form suited to their special character.' See also Dr. Mill, as above, pp. 62–3, and notes.

[2] See Mill, as above, p. 54, and especially Note A at the end of the chapter, where he shows that in adopting such an interpretation, he follows 'the general consent of ancient interpreters, and the most obvious sense of Scripture.'

Digitized by Google

were also, at this time, undergoing a change—a change indeed almost, we might suppose, as great as that which their language underwent, in which we have a striking exemplification of the effects of their sojourn in Babylon. But an impostor, writing at a later date, would scarcely have ventured to commit himself to so marked a departure from all Scripture precedent, and that without any commensurate advantage to be gained. In short we can only account for the phenomenon, on the supposition that the writer describes things as they were, with the independent boldness of one who is conscious of no desire but the one of being truthful.[1]

It is to be observed, too, that this unveiling of the operations of the angelic world is in strict accordance with the character of the documents in which it occurs. The agency of the angels is indeed asserted throughout the whole Book of Daniel; as in chap. iii. 25, 28; where an angel ('*a* son of God,' not '*the* son of God,' as

[1] The argument to be derived from the New Testament recognition of the names of angels occurring in this book, might be appropriately introduced here, did it not belong still more appropriately to another place. I have already employed it in the thread of my argument in Part I. In addition, however, to what is there said, it may be well to observe here, that the doctrine of tutelary angels, as at least very strongly implied in the Book of Daniel—Calvin says, *certainly implied;* Instit. lib. i. c. 14, § 7—is considered by Grotius as finding a confirmation in Acts xvi. 9. The 'man of Macedonia,' who appeared to Paul in a vision of the night, he regards as a parallel to 'the man Gabriel' of Dan. ix. 21. That the belief in the presiding agency of these beings was general as early as the time of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch—which would be one of the first parts of Scripture to be translated—is evident from the rendering of Deut. xxxii. 8; where, for the original, 'The Most High . . . . . set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel,' the LXX. have it, 'according to the number of *the Angels of God.*'

Digitized by Google

our version has wrongly rendered it) delivers Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego; and again in chap. vi. 22, when Daniel himself is so rescued from the mouths of the lions.[1] But it is especially in the latter portion of the book that they are brought forward so prominently; and this agrees with the apocalyptic character of that portion of the book. The writer of the article on 'Daniel' in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, says, 'His (i. e. Daniel's) apocalypse is as distinct from the prophetic writings as the Apocalypse of St. John from the Apostolic Epistles,' and it is especially in these two books, that the operations of the unseen world of angels is laid bare with this minuteness of detail.

While, therefore, as a peculiarity which would challenge attention and criticism, this mode of writing would have been carefully eschewed by an impostor wishing to invest his book with a scriptural appearance; it would appear to be entirely in keeping with the real character of the book itself, if it be genuine. We have already seen that it accords with what we might expect from one in the position Daniel is here described

[1] The expression 'the watchers,' or 'holy ones,' of ch. iv. 13, 17, 23, is easily explicable on the supposition of the book's truthfulness. The former, the עִיר, 'Ir, of the Syriac Liturgy, and there applied to the archangels (Rawlinson's Herod., vol. i. p. 504, note 8), as derived, no doubt, from the Book of Daniel—in this place (ch. iv.), where it occurs, is first, it is to be remembered, used by Nebuchadnezzar, and necessarily adopted by Daniel unchanged when he explains the dream. The reference in the mind of the king, and in him not unnatural, may have been to the four 'watchers' (the very term employed) of the Zoroastrian system. But an impostor would scarcely have represented Daniel as adopting the expression in such a manner, as might even appear to lay him open to the charge of sanctioning a false religion; while Daniel himself, conscious of no such intention, might overlook the probability of any such inference being drawn.

Digitized by Google

as occupying, though it would scarcely have suited anyone else, and that it exhibits a further appropriateness, as compared with the position and exigencies of the Jewish people, at the particular time to which it professes to belong. In all this, I think, we cannot but acknowledge the harmony of truth—the evidence of this the stronger, in proportion as the fraud would be difficult, and for more reasons than one not likely to recommend itself to an impostor. Yet if this be so, and the writer of this book enjoyed intercourse with the angels of God in his hours of need, as the book describes, can we imagine him descending to the dishonesty of professing to be what he is not? Either the book is the production of Daniel, or all this is the most marvellously unprincipled as well as ingenious deception of which the world ever heard.

SECTION XLIX.

In ch. ix. 2, the writer says:—'I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.'

The word here rendered 'books' generally means 'a letter;' it has also, in this instance, the article before it, so that some particular letter is evidently intended; and there can be little doubt that the reference is to the letter sent by Jeremiah to the Jews in captivity, as given in Jeremiah xxix.[1] Now there are three different modes found in Scripture of computing these seventy years of the captivity.[2] Two of these occur in Zechariah

[1] See Horne's Introduction; Ayre's edition, on Daniel, chap. iv. § vi. p. 849.

[2] See Lowth's Commentary on Jer. xxv. 11, and Zech. i. 12.

Digitized by Google

(i. 12 and vii. 1, 5); and the third is the one before us. The writer of this book evidently considers the seventy years as drawing near their close in the first year of Darius the Mede; he must, therefore, have reckoned them as beginning with Nebuchadnezzar's first capture of Jerusalem, now bordering on seventy years ago,[1] and when his own captivity commenced. On the other hand, Zechariah computes the seventy years, in the one case (i. 12), as ending with the *second* year of Darius Hystaspes (B.C. 520); in the other (vii. 1–5, and conf. viii. 3, 8, 11, 15), with his *fourth* (B.C. 518), the year in which he issued his decree, confirmatory of that of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the Temple. These two last computations would fix the *commencement* of the seventy years respectively at the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, in the ninth year of Zedekiah,[2] and the close of the same siege, two years later, when the city and Temple were destroyed.[3] These two latter interpretations, however, may be safely merged into one; and we may say, generally, that Zechariah dates the commencement of the seventy years from the destruction of the Temple, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, and their close with the fourth year of Darius Hystaspes, when the final decree was issued which led to the Temple's restoration.[4] Now, I argue, that had the

[1] This capture of Jerusalem occurred in the last year of Nabopolassar. Nebuchadnezzar then reigned forty-three years; Evil-merodach, two; Neriglissar, four; Laborosoarchod, not quite one; Nabonadius and Belshazzar, jointly, seventeen. Putting all together, we have 1 + 43 + 2 + 4 + nearly 1 + 17 = *nearly* 68; the first year of Darius making it nearly 69. See Berosus, quoted by Josephus, J. A. x. 11.

[2] B.C. 590; 2 Kings xxv. 1.

[3] B.C. 588; 2 Kings xxv. 4, 9, &c.

[4] See Brown's Ordo Sæclorum, pp. 198–200. It may be further

Digitized by Google

writer of the Book of Daniel been an impostor, living at a considerably later date, he would not have computed these seventy years as he does; and that for the following reasons. Writing a book which should pretend to belong to the age of the Captivity (as in that case it does), he would be careful to make himself acquainted with the generally received accounts of that period. That his own version, too, should accord with the scriptural one, would, with such a writer, and in the production of such a book, be a *sine quâ non*. We may assume, therefore, that he would know the existence of a prophecy of Jeremiah, fixing the restoration of God's people to a period of seventy years after their removal into captivity; and though that prophecy did not fix precisely, in so many words, the exact *punctum temporis*, at which that period should either commence or terminate,[1] yet that another prophet, Zechariah, *had* settled these points, by making the close of the seventy years synchronise with the decree of Darius, which effected—what that of Cyrus did not—the completion of the temple. Would not, then, the very wish to appear scriptural, be almost certain to lead him to adopt this computation of Zechariah, rather than any other,

observed that such a computation as this, taking for its dates the destruction of the Temple and the decree for its restoration, would be peculiarly appropriate in one of a priestly family, as Zechariah is supposed to have been; while we might expect a man like Daniel, versed in politics, to take a *lay* or statesman's view; which he does.

[1] We should remember that such a writer would lack much of the light that *we* possess; since one great aid to our comprehension of the history of these times, is this very book of Daniel. Whereas his task would be to produce the Book of Daniel, from and in accordance with passages which, without this link, were scattered and disconnected.

Digitized by Google

for which he would think he had no scriptural authority, and which he could hardly adopt without appearing to differ from an inspired writer? And though it may be said, on the other hand, that the computation of this book is the one most appropriate to the case of Daniel, and therefore one which a writer, personating Daniel, might well be supposed likely to introduce; while I acknowledge, to the full extent, its appropriateness *if* Daniel himself were the *author* of the book, I am no less convinced of the great improbability of its being adopted by one who only *personated* Daniel. There is another consideration, confirming me in such an opinion, besides the one already mentioned. The computation adopted in this book would not, I think, recommend itself to such a writer, from its appropriateness, so much as it may do to us, now that we have become familiar with it. We should not forget, that neither the captivity of the Jews, nor their restoration, was accomplished at once. They were carried away to Babylon by a *series* of deportations; they returned, in like manner, at separate intervals. Now, it is true, those deportations are represented as *beginning* with the first capture of Jerusalem, when Daniel and his companions were carried to Babylon; and therefore, if the predicted seventy years were considered as beginning then, the restoration would, of necessity, be viewed as synchronising with the decree of Cyrus; but, apart from what is said in this Book of Daniel, no mention is made in Scripture of any captives having been taken away at that first capture of Jerusalem; and the number there named (Dan. i. 3) is so small, that such a writer would scarcely, even if he knew of the circumstance—which is very doubtful—have ventured to rank this deportation with the subsequent ones on a very much larger

Digitized by Google

scale;[1] or fix upon it as the point for the commencement of the prophecy's fulfilment, especially when, as was shown above, an inspired prophet had already given his voice another way.

But now let us suppose Daniel the prophet to be himself the author of the book; and then how entirely does all this accord with what we should expect. In the first place, we have an independent interpretation of the prophecy of Jeremiah, such as an inspired individual would give. There is no hint or trace of his knowing any other interpretation; as indeed he could not, if he were Daniel, that of Zechariah belonging to an age when *he* had ceased to live. Secondly, this is an interpretation that most suits his own circumstances; for how natural is it for *him* to lay this stress on that first deportation, small as it was, when we remember that it was the one which tore himself from the land of his fathers, and being of some importance, too, as the first of the series. While, thirdly, we may observe, that though in the particular letter, sent by Jeremiah to the Jews in captivity, and to which most probably the

[1] It is, indeed, said (2 Chron. xxxvi. 6) that Nebuchadnezzar 'bound' Jehoiakim, 'to carry him to Babylon;' but by a reference to 2 Kings xxiv. 1, we find that he must have relented, and suffered him still to retain his throne, though only in a dependent position. Daniel (i. 3) only mentions 'certain of the children of Israel, of the king's seed and of the princes,' who were to be pensioners on the king's bounty; they could not, therefore, have been very numerous; but, in the captivity of Jehoiachin, or Jeconiah, eight years later (2 Kings xxiv. 14), as many as ten thousand were carried away; and again on the final deportation, at the close of the siege, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah (ten years later still—2 Kings xxv. 11, 12), the whole population was removed, except a few vine-dressers and husbandmen; both these deportations being on a very much larger scale than that in which Daniel was removed. Other minor deportations are mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20; Jer. lii. 28–30.

Digitized by Google

writer here refers, nothing is distinctly stated as to what should be the exact date of the commencement or close of this period of seventy years, yet amply enough is elsewhere said to confirm the computation adopted by Daniel.[1] So that, on the whole, I think we are justified in the assertion, though there would seem to be the greatest improbability that the passage before us would have been penned as it is by an impostor, yet that it accords exactly, appropriately, and truthfully with the supposition that the writer is Daniel himself.[2]

SECTION L.

It seems a singular circumstance that, in this Book of Daniel, no mention should be made of the decree of Cyrus for the restoration of the Jews. The writer is represented in ch. i. 21, as referring to the first year of Cyrus (that in which the decree was made), in language condensed indeed, but such as would be

[1] See Jer. xxv. 12; xxvii. 7, 22; where it is said that the king and nation of Babylon should be '*punished*' at the close of the *seventy* years; and that the vessels of the Temple carried to Babylon should remain there till the Lord should '*visit*' Babylon. Does not this language correspond to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus and Darius —looked forward to, as it was, by Nebuchadnezzar himself as a 'great calamity?' (see above, § viii. note 1, p. 65). Compare also the express mention of Cyrus by Isaiah xliv. 28; xlv. 1; and the language there employed.

[2] There is nothing in this which, in the least degree, militates against the correctness or inspiration of the interpretation adopted by Zechariah, on the subject of these seventy years, and which differs from that of Daniel. It is not uncommon for a prophecy to admit of more than one fulfilment; and, especially in this case, the language of Jeremiah may have been designedly indefinite, that so the prophecy might accord with different stages in the process of Jewish deportation and restoration.

Digitized by Google

pregnant with significance to every Jew. In ch. ix. again, he looks forward to the same period with an intensity of feeling, increased as the time approaches. He records, too, a vision granted to him, in answer to his earnest prayer for the deliverance of his people. Yet the eventful year itself, and the fulfilment of his heart's desire and prayer for Israel, in the decree of Cyrus, he passes over without further allusion. The ninth chapter ends with events belonging to the first year of 'Darius the Mede;' the tenth begins with 'the *third* year of Cyrus,' without a hint as to what has passed in the interim.

Now there are strong reasons for supposing that this gap did not always exist; that, in short, there was originally a chapter interposed between what at present stand as the ninth and tenth; and that that chapter is still to be found in the first of the book of Ezra, placed there, on Ezra's compilation of that book, as harmonising more completely with its historical character, than it would do with these closing chapters of the book of Daniel, which are all prophetic.[1]

Yet if this be so, the date of the Book of Daniel is at once fixed as prior to the time when the Book of Ezra

[1] This supposition is confirmed by internal evidence, to be found in the chapter itself, in certain peculiarities of style and language common to it with the Book of Daniel, and in the apparent position of the writer, as among the scenes and events which it describes. That the early part of the Book of Ezra is *not* to be ascribed to Ezra himself, except in so far as he is the editor or compiler, is quite clear. Chapter ii. is taken, almost *verbatim*, from Nehemiah vii.; from chap. iii. 2 to the end of chap. vi. is in all probability the composition of Haggai. In a similar manner several chapters of Isaiah and Jeremiah are to be found in the Book of Kings; *ex. gra.* conf. 2 Kings xviii.-xx.; Is. xxxvi.-xxxix. (See Smith's Dict. of the Bible, art. 'Book of Ezra.')

Digitized by Google

was compiled, or somewhere during or close upon the time of the Captivity; while it is also clear that Ezra regarded it as authentic. Yet if it did belong to that date—a date at which forgery would be next to impossible—it follows also, as next to a moral certainty, that it is the production of Daniel.

SECTION LI.

In the second verse of ch. x. the writer says, 'In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks.' From expressions let fall in previous chapters,[1] we should gather that the life of Daniel had been for some time one of earnest expectation for the time of the restoration of Israel; at least, such is the representation of the book.

Two years before the date to which the vision of this and the two following chapters belongs, the decree of Cyrus had gone forth, and that long wished-for event had taken place; a goodly company, numbering nearly 50,000 souls, had returned to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel,[2] and a year before this present time the rebuilding of the Temple had commenced. Thus had the earnest prayer of the aged prophet been granted; and we can almost conceive the heartfelt emotion with which he would now add that closing verse of ch. i.: 'And Daniel continued even unto the first year of King Cyrus.' Yet though all this had taken place since the events of the last chapter, we find him at the opening of the present chapter in sorrow; a sorrow, too, it must have been, of no light kind, if we are to judge of it by the unusual length of his mourning.[3] It is not, however, difficult

[1] As chap. i. 21; ix. 3–19. [2] See Ezra ii. 64.

[3] The time appointed ordinarily for mourning was seven days.

Digitized by Google

to discover a reason for this sorrow; for in Ezra iv. we find it stated that the people bordering on Judæa were exerting all their influence with the Persian sovereign to frustrate the building of the Temple; and this went on 'all the days of Cyrus.' How natural then was it that Daniel should be afflicted at this; afflicted too the more deeply in proportion as success had just before seemed certain! Yet, I think, an impostor would not have contented himself with stating that Daniel mourned in this unusual manner, and leaving it entirely unexplained; for though he might consider that the accounts of the progress of events at Jerusalem, as given by Ezra, would supply a sufficient reason for this conduct, otherwise unaccountable, yet such a writer would not be the one to leave his readers to seek for such explanations elsewhere,[1] thus needlessly multiplying the difficulties in the way of his book's credibility; rather, with such an one, we should have expected, that, in his over-anxiety to facilitate its acceptance, he would have been careful to explain every such statement as the one before us, or else, as perhaps would be more likely still, to avoid it altogether. Yet there is in the very statement itself of Daniel's mourning, and especially in the additional description of the unusual nature of his mourning, a circumstantiality of detail that we should never find, least of all thrown in gratuitously as it is

See Gen. l. 10; 1 Sam. xxxi. 13; Job ii. 3; Ecclus. xxii. 12. Ezekiel (iii. 15) mourned seven days, but here Daniel thrice seven.

[1] There is, it is true, an allusion, in the vision itself which follows, to some such opposition (ch. x. 13); where the angel Gabriel relates the hostility he had encountered from 'the Prince of Persia;' but surely this is put in too enigmatical a form to furnish a *primâ facie* reason for Daniel's mourning, which is the only kind of reason an impostor would give.

Digitized by Google

here, in any writer but one who was describing circumstances with which he was himself perfectly familiar.

SECTION LII.

The same may be said of what occurs two verses further on. The scene of this mourning of Daniel is represented as having been on the banks of the 'Hiddekel,' or Tigris. Now in ch. viii. he was on the 'Ulai,'[1] at Shushan: here he is on the Tigris, and therefore probably at or near Nineveh. This, again, is a statement which it is most improbable that an impostor would have made. He would have seen how unlikely it would appear that an aged man, such as Daniel, should be found in localities so widely apart, without some good reason for his movements. And therefore, if he introduced such details at all, he would have taken care to account for them, for the sake of his book's credibility. Yet we have here just the circumstantial mode of detail, which we might expect if the writer were himself the party concerned, and just the omission of all explanation which would be likely to characterise the accounts of such an one, who, knowing himself the entire truthfulness of all he stated, might never calculate on its being questioned by others.

SECTION LIII.

It was especially with reference to the prophecies of chap. xi. of the Book of Daniel that Porphyry[2] raised his objection to the genuineness of the whole, on the

[1] Called by the Greeks Eulæus, or Choaspes. It is the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil, Georg. iv. 211.

[2] Quoted by Jerome, Comm. in Daniel, *ad loc.*

Digitized by Google

ground that their exact accordance with the facts of history proved that they must have been written *after* the events had occurred. I have before shown that such a line of reasoning as this is suicidal.[1] It is, however, probable that this agreement was not really so great in the opinion of Porphyry as, for the sake of his argument, he asserts it to have been, and that, to give his assertion the greater appearance of truth, he actually went so far as to falsify history. Supposing that by the phrase 'at the time of the end,' occurring in ver. 40, was meant the close of the reign of Antiochus—for to that reign undoubtedly the immediately *preceding* verses refer—he stated that Antiochus, in the last year of his reign (in accordance with what, in that case, would be implied by what is said in ver. 43), did invade Egypt, and subdue it, with Libya and Æthiopia. Now, though four different invasions of Egypt are recorded by other writers, as being made in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth years of his reign (B. C. 171—168), yet no mention is made of any such expedition as this 'at the time of the end' of his reign.[2] It would appear, therefore, that Porphyry, in his anxiety to establish the fact of this exact agreement,—for that was the ground on which his attack rested,—overstepped his mark; and when he could not interpret the prophecy as agreeing with history, did not scruple to force history into accordance with prophecy. Now I mention this as evincing the *animus* of Porphyry, and I think it should go no small way in confirming our belief in the

[1] See § xli.

[2] See Smith's Dict. of Grk. and Rom. Biogr. art. 'Antiochus IV.;' an account based on the statements of Livy, Polybius, Appian (in Syriacis), Justin, Diodorus Siculus, and others. Compare also Prideaux, Conn. vol. ii. book iii.

Digitized by Google

genuineness of the book before us; for if this were the main argument he could produce, we may judge of its worthlessness, by the fact that it could only be sustained at the expense of truth; and whatever serves to weaken the cause of an opponent, may fairly be regarded as strengthening our own. But further, while such a perversion of truth shows us the unscrupulousness of Porphyry, it also discloses his own consciousness of the weakness of his case, and therefore furnishes us with a double reason for not accepting his arguments; while, in support of the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, it may be said, that if one so unscrupulous could find no better arguments than those based on palpable falsehood, and out of those none better than this, its position, as the work of Daniel, must be impregnable indeed.

I should here add, that though, according to the interpretation adopted by Porphyry, which takes the phrase 'the time of the end,' in verse 40, as referring to the end of the reign of Antiochus, there is no agreement here with the facts of history, as given by other writers, yet there is another interpretation, by which we have so close an agreement, as to leave scarcely any room for a doubt as to its being the true one.[1] The part of the chapter extending from ver. 40 to the end, would seem to be a brief recapitulation of what has gone before; and the words just quoted (from ver. 40) may be understood as meaning not so much the end of the reign of Antiochus, as the end of that whole period, embraced in the chapter, from the time of 'Darius the Mede' (ver. 1),

[1] Newton, indeed (On the Prophecies, pp. 308–315), and others, understand this part of the prophecy as referring to Antichrist, or to the Roman power; but the application is too forced to recommend itself.

Digitized by Google

down to the evident break in the context at ver. 45; in which period, extending as it did over about 350 years, 'the time of the end' might well include the *whole reign* of Antiochus, which lasted only eleven years. Such a summary, too, while reverting to matters already mentioned, would also afford an opportunity for the introduction of details hitherto omitted, as well as to state how the whole was to terminate.[1]

Now, though such recapitulations are not uncommon, yet it is very unlikely that an impostor would have so written. To fall back, as it were, and retraverse the ground which he had already travelled, without marking the change by some evident pause or break in the context, such an one, thoughtful as he would be of his language, would consider a needless multiplying of difficulties, and therefore it would have been carefully avoided by him. But Daniel, writing by divine inspiration, and rapt in the importance of his matter, might overlook such minor details as this, and so leave in the texture of his work difficulties which should one day prove 'for the rise and fall of many in Israel.' And, as in the former respect, viz. the argument of Porphyry, it would seem to have been of the providential supervision of God that the enemy to His Word should unconsciously reveal to us the weakness of his cause, thereby confirming the truth of that word; so in this feature we have what is perfectly natural if this book be the genuine work of Daniel the prophet, as it professes to be, but what is unnatural if it be spurious.

[1] See the commentaries of Barnes and of Lowth on the passage.

Digitized by Google

SECTION LIV.

In the first three verses of ch. xii., though the reference is, no doubt, primarily, as before, to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, yet it is quite clear that the language is at the same time designed to bear upon other events more distant and momentous still. Along with the allusion to the great troubles which should come upon the Jewish nation at that time, and the promise of their ultimate deliverance, there is blended the clearest reference to be found in the Old Testament to the doctrines of the final resurrection,[1] and the eternity of future rewards and punishments. Now, apart from the consideration, that the very clearness of the language, here employed on these topics, would itself argue the inspiration of the writer, it is most improbable that an impostor, wishing his book to pass as Scripture, would have ventured thus to employ language in advance of all that Scripture had yet revealed. Nay, it is scarcely probable that it would have even occurred to him to introduce such an allusion at all, so entirely disconnected, as these subjects manifestly are, from the matter in hand. But if Daniel be the author of the book, then we can understand how, writing as he is moved by the Holy Ghost, and recording the divine communications as he actually received them, *he* is unshackled by any such rules and restrictions as a counterfeit would be sure to impose upon himself; and on this supposition, we recognise here another instance of a practice not uncommon in prophecy, of blending together in one events really

[1] The different passages in the Old Testament bearing on the resurrection are collected and examined by Harold Browne, 'On the Thirty-nine Articles,' pp. 195–203; this of Daniel is the climax.

Digitized by Google

distinct;[1] the language made use of being in part applicable to both, while in part the more distant object is allowed to overshadow the nearer; a mode of writing as natural in Daniel as in any other *prophet*, but such as would not be likely to be adopted by an impostor.

SECTION LV.

The perspicuity attaching to the preceding part of this prophecy, is, in the twelfth chapter, succeeded by great obscurity; yet it is not the obscurity which would be found in a spurious production. Had the author been an impostor, and living in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, as asserted by Porphyry, one of two things is likely. Either he would have shrunk from extending his pretended prophecy beyond his own times, considering that the sudden transition, from the previous accuracy (acknowledged on all hands) to the mere guesses, however sagacious, in which alone he could now deal, would be so marked as to betray the secret of his non-inspiration, and so at once stamp his book as a forgery; or, on the other hand, if he did venture to go further, it would only be in such general and indefinite terms, as would admit of an interpretation to accord with what turn soever events might take. Neither of these, however, is the course adopted by the writer of this chapter. He does not confine himself to the times of Antiochus; since it is quite evident that, though employing language partly applicable to that age, the range of his vision yet reaches even to the end of time. Nor, again, can it be said, that his language is of that indefinite kind, which an impostor would employ; since we have periods of

[1] See Barnes, Introduction to Isaiah, § VII. iii. (3) (4) (5).

Digitized by Google

time specified (as in vv. 7, 11, 12) with the greatest exactness, and events mentioned (as in vv. 7, 11) in a manner which has nothing vague about it. The full meaning of the words is indeed enveloped in mystery; yet it is a mystery quite in keeping with the manner and intent of their introduction. The design of the vision was completed, when (in ver. 4) the prophet was commanded to 'shut up the words and seal the book;' and these subsequent predictions only purport to be fragmentary hints, added, by way of supplement, to the whole. But that 'prophecy before its fulfilment is an enigma,' is an acknowledged axiom;[1] and those only, who shall live to see the times here referred to, will be in a position to decide on the truth of these predictions by their actual fulfilment or failure.[2] Meanwhile, with the writer himself,[3] we need deem it no objection to their genuineness that we cannot fathom their full purport; and, with the patient waiting of other true servants who have tarried the Lord's leisure, and been strong in the evidence of things not seen, let us leave their full solution to those times, also here predicted, when 'knowledge shall be increased' (ver. 4), as the history of facts itself comes to supply a commentary to a revelation, the obscurity of which, we may be sure, is not due to an impostor's inability to read the future, but to the will of an all-wise God, who would, by the dark sayings of old,

[1] See Bishop Andrew's Tortura Torti, p. 186.

[2] See Polé's Synopsis, vol. iii. 283, 284.

[3] The admission, in verse 8, of the writer's ignorance as to the purport of this part of the revelation would scarcely have been made by an impostor personating the *learned and holy* Daniel; though it is nevertheless a fact that prophets were not always able to interpret the predictions they might be commissioned to deliver. (See Wordsworth's Grk. Test., note on 2 Pet. i. 20.)

Digitized by Google

blended with the light of revelation, test and employ and discipline our faith.

Thus far of the evidence to be adduced in this division of my subject. Scotland's greatest bard, in his 'Lady of the Lake,' gives a poet's description of the highlander bearing aloft the fiery cross of war, and as he speeds through the land, over moor and mountain, from hamlet and hidden glen, by that sacred sign calling forth the clansmen to muster in the defence of hearth and home. So too, in a figure, have I humbly ventured to bear the brand through this portion of Holy Writ; and though unworthy my advocacy, not so, I think, the response it has encountered. The very ground about me I have found teeming with armed men, arguments ready on the summons to spring into life in a cause so holy. Hidden in the depths and bypaths of its texture, they have yet gathered in force more than sufficient to maintain the cause of the book to which they belong.

From the very process, however, by which such evidence is collected, it must necessarily be presented in a very disconnected form; and, so, robbed, in no inconsiderable degree, of the force it would possess united. I shall therefore conclude this part of my subject, by briefly reviewing, by way of recapitulation, the leading heads under which the preceding arguments may naturally be made to range themselves; and though they have throughout[1] been discussed and worked out, so as to bear a distinct and independent testimony, and to stand, each alone, and on its own merits; yet I think we shall find their *concurrent* value such as no possible

[1] With one only exception, § xxi.

Digitized by Google

reasoning on the opposite side can gainsay or invalidate—that the forces which, when scattered, were formidable, when united, are overwhelming.

One of the first thoughts to suggest itself, on a retrospective glance through the continuous examination to which I have subjected the book, is the manner in which the *unity of the authorship* comes out. We discover this in a similarity of style,[1] as in the language of the decrees of chapters iii. and vi., compared with the language of Nebuchadnezzar in ch. iv. 34, 35; this similarity of style also appearing, in some respects, even under a variation in the language employed; as in the writer's mode of dating events[2]—almost peculiar to himself, and therefore also what would have been avoided by an impostor, though we find it in this book in both Hebrew and Aramaic; or, again, in his habit, continually presenting itself to our notice, of inadvertently omitting the explanation of events connected with himself, natural indeed in Daniel under the peculiar circumstances, if the book be genuine, but not so in anyone else.[3] We discover it again in the manner in which the whole is linked together; partly by references to what has gone before,[4] partly by the gradual change from the historical use of the third person to that of the first; the writer, with the change of his subject-matter, from history to prophecy, also assuming his own personality, yet that by so gentle a transition, as to do no violence to the tenor of his book;[5] partly by the man-

[1] See § xxxix.

[2] See Dan. ii. 1; vii. 1; ix. 1; x. 1; xi. 1.

[3] See §§ iii. x. xi. xvi. xix. xxxiv. xlvi. li. lii.

[4] See Dan. viii. 1; ix. 21. In x. 1, the words, 'Daniel whose name was Belteshazzar,' evidently refer back to i. 7

[5] See § xlii.; and p. 129, note 1.

Digitized by Google

ner in which the two languages originally employed in the book are interwoven by the context—a connection this so inseparably intricate, that we cannot well regard them in any light but as forming one whole—a *hendiadys*, of which the unity is still unbroken, though composed of separate elements.[1] We see this again in the manner in which the prophetic parts of the book *hang together;* the later, in the *mode of their communication*, showing an advance on the earlier,[2] while, in their *matter*, they successively enlarge on and develope each other; thus establishing so close a mutual relation,[3] that no one part can be spared, or even well change its place, without injuring the symmetry and unity of the whole. Lastly, we see this corroborated by the general character of the book itself. 'We cannot fail,' says Hävernick,[4] 'to discover in the writer a person of vast information, 'and well versed in the management of affairs.' This exactly corresponds to the asserted condition of the writer, and it appears as much in the political mould in which the *prophetic* portions of the book are cast, as in the circumstances detailed in its *history*. 'The symbols used by a prophet are borrowed,' says M. de Pressensé,[5] 'from the conditions of the time in which he lived.' Of

[1] This appears in the manner in which the Aramaic is introduced (chap. ii. 4), beginning in the middle of a sentence, while it ends, not as we might have expected, with the change from history to prophecy, at the close of chapter vi., but one chapter further on; thus running into, and, as it were, becoming inseparably wedded with, the rest of the book *at both ends;* it has not even the distinctiveness of a parenthesis, but is only a part of the one unbroken production in a different *dress.*

[2] See p. 124, note 2.

[3] See § xl., *the whole of it.*

[4] Kitto's Biblical Cyclop., art. 'Daniel.'

[5] De Pressensé on the Religions before Christ, p. 215, Engl. Transl.

Digitized by Google

all the prophets, Daniel—if this book be true—was pre-eminently the statesman; and, throughout the book, we have nothing but what comes well from the pen of such a person: from first to last, even in the form which the divine communications here assume, it is stamped with the same individual idiosyncrasies. Thus in the whole book, and in its component parts, in what it professes and in what it incidentally discloses, we have the strongest testimony to its being the production of *one individual.*

We have now further to identify this individual with Daniel the prophet. As one important step towards this, I observe that several of the arguments which I have deduced from the character of the book and its contents, serve most incontestably to fix it to *the time of the Captivity*, the period when Daniel is therein said to have flourished. This we found to be indicated strongly by expressions occurring in the book, (i.) which would have no significance to recommend them, and therefore, were not at all likely to have been used, unless they were written during the Captivity;[1] or (ii.) such as would have even appeared decidedly objectionable to one writing at a later date,[2] though natural enough to one in the asserted position of Daniel. We found traces of it (iii.) in a remarkable omission in the book,[3] as it now stands, which can be satisfactorily supplied if the book were written before that of Ezra, i.e. near the time of the Captivity, but otherwise is unaccountable. We saw it (iv.) in the texture of the two languages in which the book was originally composed;[4] the particular stage of developement to which they both belong, regarded philologically, exhibiting a correspondence with

[1] See § iv.
[2] See § liv.
[3] See § l.
[4] See §§ vi. and xlvii.

Digitized by Google

the time of the Captivity so minutely exact, even in instances of which the very reverse was at one time predicated,[1] that it would have been impossible, humanly speaking—and it is only with the *human* view our adversaries deal—for the book to have been produced, in the form in which we find it, at a later date than the time, or nearly the time, of the Captivity. Thus is the book fixed with a degree of certainty almost absolute to the *time* at which Daniel is represented to have lived.[2]

Our next step is to gather together the testimony as to the *place* of the book's production. This we saw, in a number of instances, to point in the most incidental, yet decisive, manner to Babylon.

We discovered (i.) clear, though indirect, traces of the writer's familiarity with Babylon,[3] its institutions[4] and geography;[5] in some instances a knowledge of local history being displayed, not merely beyond that of later writers,[6] and so indicative of the writer being a *contemporary* of the events he describes, as in other cases we should infer that he must have been an *eye-witness*[7]—

[1] See § xvii.

[2] While the references to him in Ezekiel show that he could not have lived at a later date than the Captivity (as pointed out in Part I.), the character of the language employed is such as would not have occurred at an earlier period. Thus are we enabled to contract within very narrow limits, the time at which the book was written; and the more narrowly we limit it, the more closely it agrees with the accounts of the book itself.

[3] See §§ xvi. xxix.

[4] See §§ vii. xiii. xxxviii.

[5] See §§ xx. xlvi. Compare Dan. x. 4, and § lii.

[6] See §§ xxvii. xxviii. xxxi. xxxiii.

[7] The account of the handwriting on the wall has all the circumstantiality of the description of an eye-witness, while at the same time there is also an important omission (see § xxxii.) which would never have been allowed by an impostor.

Digitized by Google

but even exceeding the knowledge of persons actually living at that time, though not brought, as the Daniel of this book would be, into contact with such institutions.[1] We saw the same (ii.) to be indicated in the effects of Babylonian associations; appearing forcibly, in one instance, in the particular expression employed to fix a date;[2] in two others, giving a particular character to the symbolic imagery of the dreams recorded.[3] And (iii.) lastly, in the particular form given to the doctrine of the book, on the subject of the angelic ministrations and titles; in which, while we saw no reason to allow that it was borrowed, as some have asserted, from the heathen systems of the time, but decidedly the reverse—the Jewish religion being possessed of an 'originality too marked to allow us to suspect that it lived on loans,'[4]—and the similarity to the heathen systems not being close enough to indicate any copying—we yet saw a safeguard provided against the particular forms of mythology which would be encountered *at Babylon*;[5] this last a piece of evidence of peculiar value, since, though this relation to the heathen systems prevalent at Babylon renders the new form of the doctrine—so far as it *is* new—which we find here, peculiarly appropriate, if revealed at the time of the Captivity, yet its very novelty would probably have decided an impostor, writing at a later date, against admitting it into his book at all.

Thus is the *time* and the *place* of the book fixed with the greatest degree of certainty that under the circumstances is possible; for, be it remembered, the arguments

[1] As Jeremiah and Ezekiel. See § vii.

[2] See § i. [3] See §§ xiv. xliii.

[4] De Pressensé, Religions before Christ, p. 193, Eng. Transl. 1862.

[5] See § xlviii.

Digitized by Google

here referred to are mostly based upon features in the book, either far too incidental to have been the result of conscious design, or else, from their very nature, such as no one would have forged, even had he the ability to do so, since, in the eyes of such an one, they would have been attended by disadvantages far too great to allow of his introducing them. Evidence of this kind cannot well deceive. Yet the time and place assigned by this evidence to the writer of this book are exactly those in which Daniel the prophet is, by the book itself, asserted to have flourished.

We now pass on to the evidence bearing more immediately upon the *person* of the author. And (i.) we notice the claim of the book itself to be the production of Daniel. This alone should incline us to believe it to be so, until the claim be either disproved, or at the least proved improbable. That it has not yet been disproved is certain, neither is it improbable: since we have already seen the book's production to be fixed, with the utmost possible certainty, to the time and place at which it also asserts that he flourished: and that being so, it is most improbable that any one writing at that date, if no such person as this Daniel existed, should have invented such a character for his book, and assigned him so prominent a part in public affairs; or, if Daniel *were* an historical personage, should have ventured, or even desired to personate a contemporary; or that, had he done so, the forgery would have been suffered to circulate — the last an improbability which is rendered still greater when we take into consideration the jealousy with which the Jews watched over their Scriptures, and the care they took to exclude what was of questionable character or authority: instance, 'The Story of Susannah,' 'The History of Bel and the Dragon,' and 'The Song of

Digitized by Google

the Three Children,' once surreptitiously, but vainly, attempted to be appended to this book. But if a book, which appears, even on the test of a searching investigation, to be, in other respects, entirely worthy of credit, also lays claim to a certain authorship, that general accuracy should certainly be a strong reason for our crediting the claim. That the book of Daniel is thus deserving of credit in the highest degree, has been more than adequately established, by many of the pieces of evidence, to be found in the foregoing pages. Briefly to recapitulate them: we saw this (1) in the strikingly minute truthfulness of its accounts in those instances where they could be brought to the touchstone of other sources of information;[1] we saw it (2) again in the verisimilitude of many other of its representations, which, though not actually borne out by any extraneous authorities, from the very lack of all such wherewith to compare them, yet possess in themselves all the characteristics of truth;[2] several of these instances being evidently pictures drawn from the life, so accurately true are they to nature.[3] Yet if the writer were thus scrupulously correct in these matters,—truth evidently his aim and object,—why should we doubt him in the one solitary instance of his own identity?

(ii.) But this need not be left depending on the evident truthfulness of the book alone; though that were indeed strong enough to support it in the absence of any testimony to the contrary. There is evidence to carry us much further than this. Throughout the book we continually stumble upon indications of the author's

[1] See §§ i. viii. xxv. xxvi. xxvii. xlvi. li.
[2] See §§ ii. ix. xxi. xxx. xxxv. xxxviii.
[3] See §§ x. xxiv. xxxvi. xxxvii.

Digitized by Google

independent mode of writing,[1] in a manner and degree only natural in one who is telling truly what he knows to be facts. He has evidently nothing to conceal; the thought of detection in falsehood has never crossed his brain; nay, with the boldness of an honest man,—the *mens conscia recti* predominating—by the very form in which he puts his narrative, he more than once even challenges enquiry, and refutation if it be possible.[2] In all this we have, surely, the confidence of one who knows his statements to be unimpeachable, and this shewn in a manner so entirely incidental, that, while its frequency of occurrence forbids our setting it lightly aside as a stray accident without significance, the more we examine it, the more certain becomes the conviction that it cannot be the *imitation* of truth designed by an impostor—that it is not the *paraded* confidence of one who would affect what he does not feel—but the truth, which *will* reveal itself, whether the writer be consciously directing his thoughts to the manner of its appearance or not. Yet would he have written with this confidence pervading his every word, if he were assuming a false name, and guilty of misrepresentations, as he must have been if he were not Daniel; representations too, which would in some cases affect the characters of those whom he mentioned,[3] and therefore draw upon him attention, and, if untrue, indignation as well? For an impostor to act thus, would be nothing short of a suicidal infatuation, which must have led to his exposure. It is indeed natural in Daniel, but incomprehensible in any one else.

(iii.) But, again, we find casual expressions, scattered

[1] See §§ i. ii. v. x. xi. xv. xvi. xix. xxii. xxiii. xxxi. xxxii. xxxiii. xxxiv. xliv. xlv. xlvi. xlviii. xlix. li. lii. liv. lv.

[2] See §§ xxi. xxxv.

[3] See § xxi.

Digitized by Google

up and down the book, and invested with all the force of *independent* testimony, as the *unconscious* utterance of truth, which reveal the most minute accordance between the *position* of the writer and that ascribed to Daniel. Is Daniel described as 'that Daniel which is of the children of the Captivity' (ch. vi. 13)? This is indicated as having been his own position most incidentally by the writer in speaking of a totally different matter:[1] namely, in his mode of dating the period of Nebuchadnezzar's first coming to Jerusalem: where, under a superficial appearance of incorrectness, compared with other accounts, which would have deterred an impostor aiming at the *appearance* of truth from using the expression, we discover, along with the mode of thought and feeling peculiarly appropriate to a Jewish captive, also a trace of his being in high office; the latter in a singular manner corroborated by his mode of dating in other parts of the book, as contrasted with the method adopted by Ezekiel, who lived at the same time as Daniel is asserted to have done, though under different circumstances.[2] The dates given by the writer of our book, are those of a government official; those in Ezekiel a private captive's.

It is asserted again that Daniel 'sat in the gate of the

[1] See § i. In the rank, again, of the enemies of Daniel, whose machinations to compass his ruin are recorded in ch. vi., we have an indication of his own elevated position, since otherwise he would scarcely have incurred their envy; and on the truthfulness of this part of the book, see § xxxv.

[2] See § v. *ad fin.* His familiarity with the college of Chaldæans (see § vii.) as contrasted with the ignorance of Ezekiel, who, though in Babylon, was not officially brought in contact with them, has been already alluded to; it agrees exactly with the position of Daniel.

Digitized by Google

king,' i.e. had official employment at court (ch. ii. 49); that he did 'the king's business' (viii. 27); and he is represented as being consulted by three different sovereigns who sat on the throne of Babylon (chapters iii. v. vi.); in accordance with this we have indications — the most indirect that can be conceived, and therefore impossible to have been thrown in with the design of keeping up the deception — that the writer was familiar with the palace,[1] or local information connected with the court,[2] under two out of these three sovereigns; while the manner in which he depicts the character and bearing of the third[3] on an important occasion shows almost beyond a doubt that the king stood for his picture, and that in the writer's description of Daniel he was delineating *himself*. In short, it cannot possibly be conceived that a book could contain within itself stronger evidence of its truth generally, or particularly on the point of its authorship. Evidence which from its very nature is incapable of lying, not only reveals to us the time and country in which the author wrote, but follows him into his privacy; opens to us his heart; brings before the world his inmost feelings, and weighs his accidental expressions; and in all this — in a manner the most minute, and in instances too often repeated to admit of a doubt of their significance — he is found to be, what he himself declares himself to be, Daniel, the instructor of kings and the beloved of God. As I have before observed, it would be impossible, within the limits of a work like the present, to take into account all the evidence to be derived from the actual fulfilment of the prophecies of

[1] See § xii. Compare also Dan. viii. 2; where the circumstantial manner of mentioning the Palace Shushan would also imply an acquaintance with it.

[2] See § xxix.

[3] See § xxxvii.

Digitized by Google

the book of Daniel by the events of history; while such an enquiry more properly belongs to the province of interpretation. Still, in the foregoing pages, I did introduce three arguments bearing upon this portion of the subject, which in no small degree confirmed the conclusions otherwise arrived at. In one of these[1] I pointed out the harmony existing between the different and distinct prophetic portions of the book; which was hidden indeed beneath an overlying variety of detail, so great that an impostor would have regarded the effort necessary to produce it as so much lost labour, and therefore would never have put himself to the trouble of producing it; and yet, on examination, is really so great and so minutely accordant, that we cannot imagine it as anything short of the result of divine inspiration; and if so,—worked up, as it all is, with the claim of the book to be the production of Daniel, that claim also is confirmed in proportion as we regard the book as inspired. In a second argument,[2] connected with this branch of the subject, I showed that Porphyry, the first individual to doubt the book's prophetic character, had really framed his arguments in such a manner that they defeated themselves; and that, supposing we were to allow the truth of all the facts he adduced, yet that portions of the book would still remain of which the prophetic character could not be doubted. While in a third and later argument,[3] I pointed out that there were strong reasons for believing that Porphyry was himself aware of the weakness of his own case; and that he even went so far, in order to give his arguments an appearance of plausibility, as to falsify history; and that weak indeed must be the case, and *consciously so*, which could only be maintained

[1] See § xl. [2] See § xli. [3] See § liii.

Digitized by Google

at the expense of truth. To add this to all that I have just recapitulated, is to make assurance doubly sure. Since if the prophecies are real, they are 'of God;' and blended as the claim of the book to be the production of Daniel the prophet is with their very texture as prophecies, if that claim be false, we make God himself a party to, if not the actual author of, a lie. Μὴ γένοιτο.

To conclude:—In the first part of this work I endeavoured to show that, from *external* considerations, there was a strong *antecedent probability* of the writer of the book being what he professed to be. He has now been placed at the bar to speak for himself, and undergo a searching cross-examination. There can be but one opinion, I think, of the result, in every honest mind; viz. that the evidence this examination has elicited has raised that antecedent probability into a moral certainty.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART III.

THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PART III.

I NOW enter on the last of the three parts into which this subject naturally divides itself. Having shown, first, that without such a book as that of Daniel, the Bible, as a scheme of revelation, would be incomplete, and the *antecedent probability* which must in consequence be allowed to exist in the book's favour; and secondly, that *internally*, in its texture and contents, the book not only bears about it strong indications of being genuine, but that it is even distinguished by many features which are quite unaccountable on any other hypothesis —it only remains to gather together the *external* or *historical* testimony, so far as any exists, to its actual acceptance and recognition from the earliest times, as being what it claims to be. This, however, is a part of the subject which has been so fully and repeatedly discussed by others, that a brief account of it is all which I shall give here; referring those who wish for more to the pages of the two Chandlers [1] and Bishop Newton,[2] or, as more recent authorities, to the writings

[1] Dr. S. Chandler's Vindication of the Antiquity and Authority of the Prophecies of Daniel; and Bishop Chandler's Vindication of the Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament.

[2] Dissertation on the Prophecies.

Digitized by Google

of Tregelles,[1] Barnes,[2] and (better still) to those of Hengstenberg,[3] who has indeed left little but gleanings for those who follow after him. The most convenient starting point for this discussion, is the first century of the Christian era, and the position we find the book occupying then.

And here there is the fullest and most satisfactory evidence to shew that it was, at that date, regarded as genuine. For, firstly, it stood among the contents of the received Canon of Scripture.

This is proved both by the language of Josephus and others,[4] as well as by the extant catalogues of the canonical books, both of that and of later dates:[5] all of which agree in admitting this book, though—what is really a matter of little importance to the enquiry in hand—they are not equally unanimous as to the *position* in the Canon to be assigned to it.[6] Now when we bear

[1] Remarks on the Prophetic Visions in the Book of Daniel.

[2] Commentary on the Book of Daniel.

[3] Die Authentie des Daniel; or the English translation, by Pratten.

[4] Vid. Joseph. J. A. lib. x. c. 10, § 4, where he expressly reckons it among 'the Sacred Scriptures' (τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν) of the Jews; and again, § vi. of the same chapter, among their 'ancient books' (τοῖς ἀρχαίοις βιβλίοις). For other authorities, see Stuart on the Old Testament Canon, pp. 431-452.

[5] See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Canon.'

[6] This difference, however, would appear to have arisen at a later date, and may be accounted for in more ways than one; none of which, however, militate (as they have been groundlessly asserted as doing) against the book's genuineness. From the expression used by Josephus (cont. Ap. lib. i. § 8) it is clear that he places the book in the second division of the Canon, or among the Prophets. (See Barnes, Comm. on Daniel, Introd. § II. iv. (1) (a), p. 38, ed. Henderson; or Stuart on the Old Testament Canon pp. 256-264; and Chandler's Vindication of Daniel, arg. iv.) As also do the following Christian authorities: Melito of Sardis, Origen, the

Digitized by Google

in mind the reverence entertained by the Jews for their Scriptures, and the jealousy with which they watched over them, feelings so deeply rooted that, as Josephus assures us,[1] they would gladly die rather than

Council of Laodicea, the Canones Apostol., Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius, Synopsis Scripturæ in Athen., the Council of Hippo, Hilary, and Rufinus. But the Jewish catalogues subsequent to the times of Josephus, and with them Jerome, place it among the Hagiographa. [See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Canon,' ii. (β).] On this circumstance have been based the leading arguments of Bertholdt, Bleek, and others, on the continent; of Collins, and more recently of Dr. Williams (Essays and Reviews, p. 77), in England against the genuineness of the book. They have, however, been so completely refuted by Stuart, Hengstenberg, and others (see Stuart, Old Test. Canon, § 9–13; and Hengstenberg, Die Authent. des Daniel, c. ii. § iv., c. iii. § ii.), that I need not enter into the question here. I shall merely state that it is probable that the book was not placed amongst the Hagiographa till some time after Christ, and that its removal to that place, from the second division in the Canon, can be easily accounted for on any one or more of the following grounds :—(1) Its mixed character, as partly prophetic, partly historic ; (2) The particular character of the divine communications therein contained, which, as being made by means of *dreams*, were not regarded as belonging to the first order of revelation,—though in fact the theory of *degrees* in inspiration is a fiction of later date (conf. Dr. W. Lee On Inspiration, appendix C.) ; (3) The fact that Daniel, like David, was not *officially* a prophet, and as holding various appointments under a heathen monarch, might be deemed unfit to rank among the Jewish prophets ; or (4) The desire of the Jews to degrade, as far as possible, a book which bore testimony so direct to the Messiahship of Christ. While the particular place it occupies among the Hagiographa, in close proximity to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, books belonging to almost the same period and circumstances to which it also lays claim, and having in the same category the Psalms—whose language more than once in the New Testament is pronounced to be the utterance of the Holy Ghost (see Acts i. 16 ; Heb. iii. 7)—so far from tending in any way to impugn its genuineness, is a strong argument to the contrary.

[1] Cont. Ap. lib. 1, § 8. Compare also the assertion of Philo

Digitized by Google

permit any diminution, addition, or alteration in them; we have the strongest reasons for believing that in the Jewish mind there was, at that period, no doubt of the inspired character of the books, one and all, composing the Canon; a belief which, in the case of the particular book now under consideration, is further confirmed by the nature of some of its contents. For of all the Old Testament predictions as to the time of the Messiah's coming, and the treatment he should receive, predictions which found their exact fulfilment in Christ. none are more definite than those of this book. How clear indeed they were understood to be, even before their fulfilment, may be gathered from the circumstance mentioned by Grotius,[1] that the Rabbi Nehumias, who flourished fifty years before Christ, declared that the time specified by Daniel, for the date of the Messiah's coming could not be distant more than *fifty* years. A book plainly fixing on them the stigma of rejecting and crucifying the Lord of Glory, could not but be most unacceptable to the Jews: and while this would be, in itself sufficient to account for their subsequently transferring the book from its place among the prophets to the Hagiographa, the fact that it was still suffered to remain in the Canon at all, after its predictions had been so literally fulfilled, to their condemnation, is the strongest evidence that the position it claimed, as the inspired production of the prophet Daniel, was, in their judgment unassailable.

But beyond this, the book is distinctly stated to be inspired. Josephus,[2] while speaking of the book of

(apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. viii.), that they would rather die a thousand deaths than suffer a single letter of their sacred books to be altered.

[1] Grotius de Verit. Relig. Christ. lib. v. § xiv.

[2] J. A. lib. x. c. xi. § 7.

Digitized by Google

Daniel, ranks Daniel himself, as the writer, as 'one of the greatest of the prophets,' says that 'he did not only prophesy of future events, as did the other prophets, but also determined the time of their accomplishment,' speaks of the 'undeniable veracity of his predictions,[1] and much more of the same nature. The recognition accorded to the book by Christ and the writers of the New Testament—the allusions there made to it (as shewn in Part I.) considerably exceeding the average amount of such reference to single books of the Old Testament—as the language of inspiration, should be sufficient, even taken alone, to stamp the book, in the mind of every believer, as being beyond a doubt genuine; yet it is not a little remarkable that men even of piety and learning[2] have *got over* this testimony in a manner,

[1] Aben Ezra and the Rabbi Jacchiades use language similar to that of Josephus; and Maimonides (More Nevochim, ii. 45), though, with the Jews, generally ranking the book among the Hagiographa, yet says that 'Daniel, the Psalms, &c., are all written by the Holy Spirit.'

[2] I allude to the language of Dr. Arnold (see his life, vol. ii. p. 195, 5th edition):—'I have long thought that the greater part of the book of Daniel is *most certainly a very late work*, of the time of the Maccabees; and the *pretended* prophecy about the kings of Grecia and Persia, and of the North and South, is mere history, like the poetical prophecies in Virgil and elsewhere,' &c. It is true that Pratten, the translator of Hengstenberg's work (see Translator's Preface to Hengstenberg on Daniel) has shown that this passage was not the result of unbiassed judgement, but written under the influence of personal feeling; still it exhibits in a mournful light, the dangerous effects of an insufficient reverence for Scripture. Daniel, pronounced a 'prophet' by Christ, is, in the judgement of Dr. Arnold, but on a par with Virgil and other profane writers. A recent legal decision (see the Judgement of Dr. Lushington in the case of the Bishop of Salisbury *versus* Williams, § 9) has, indeed, acquitted Dr. Williams of the guilt of denying the genuineness of the Book of Daniel. But, however unimpeachable that decision may be in a

Digitized by Google

apparently, quite to the satisfaction of their own conscience, and have even gone so far as deliberately to pronounce the writings, to which their Saviour referred as to those of a 'prophet,' to be nothing better than a forgery. Their reasoning indeed, when fairly examined is utterly destitute of force;[1] but since an argument

court of law, there can be little doubt that it would stand nowhere else. If words mean anything, the following extracts from the review of Bunsen's Biblical Researches (Essays and Reviews) will show this at once. In p. 62 (1st ed.) he says, 'That there was a Bible before our Bible, and that some of our present books, as certainly Genesis and Joshua, and perhaps Job, Jonah, and Daniel, are expanded from simpler elements, is indicated in the book before us, rather than *proved as it might be;*' again, in p. 69, 'In the case of Daniel, he *may doubt* whether all parts of the book are of one age;' in p. 76, 'In distinguishing the man Daniel from our Book of Daniel, and in bringing the latter as low as the reign of (Antiochus) Epiphanes, our author only *follows the admitted necessities of the case* . . . not only Macedonian words . . . and . . . the minute description of Antiochus's reign, but the stoppage of such description at that precise date, 169 B.C., remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book;' and again, p. 77, 'The *current error*' as to the book (i.e. its acceptance as genuine) 'is discreditable to divines.' And lest it should be said that, as a Reviewer, he is here only giving the opinions of the author he is reviewing, and not necessarily his own, let all this be read by the light of a correspondence previously carried on with the Lord Bishop of St. David's, and in which he (Dr. Williams) evidently regards it as a no longer doubted fact that Daniel is a late forgery. (See 'An earnestly respectful letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's, on the difficulty of bringing theological questions to an issue,' by R. Williams, D.D.; also, his 'Critical Appendix upon the Lord Bishop of St. David's Reply' to the same. Macmillan & Co. 1860.)

[1] The grounds, for instance, on which the testimony of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 15) to the fact of Daniel being a 'prophet' is sought to be invalidated, namely, that he is only adopting the current language of the day, and not speaking *expressly or authoritatively* with reference to the question of the book's genuineness, is, indeed, as unbecoming an evasion as anything which modern scepticism has

Digitized by Google

like the present is greatly strengthened, if we can afford (for the occasion) to waive such disputed points, however illogically disputed, and draw our conclusions only from the common ground acknowledged by all, I shall not press this testimony to the extent to which it might be legitimately employed. If, however, we take the language of Christ as nothing more than that of a human individual, it certainly does, in conjunction with the other New Testament references to this book, so numerous as they are, prove beyond a doubt, this much being conceded by all, that the book was in that day universally recognised as among the Jewish Scriptures; while from the manner in which the High Priest[1] charges Christ with blasphemy, when he applies a prophecy of Daniel to Himself, it is quite clear that the *prophetic* nature of the book was also fully acknowledged among the Jews. Thus there can be no doubt as to the opinion entertained during the first few years of the Christian era and later.[2] A question then next arises as to the value to be attached to this general verdict; and we enquire, does the recognised presence of the Book of Daniel in the Canon, or among the authorised Scriptures, carry us back to a period sufficiently near the (reputed) times of Daniel to preclude the possibility of error on this point?

The Jewish tradition[3] was that Ezra and the members of the great synagogue brought together all the books

ventured to put forth. The expression of De Wette—§ 255 (3)—'Christ neither would (wollte), nor could (konnte), from the nature of the case, be a critical authority,' seems little short of blasphemy.

[1] Matt. xxvi. 64.

[2] Porphyry, who was the first to doubt the book's genuineness, wrote in the middle of the third century of our era.

[3] See Prideaux's Connection, vol. i. pp. 329–344, and the evidence there adduced.

Digitized by Google

of the Old Testament, with the exception of those of Ezra himself, Nehemiah, and Malachi; these latter being subsequently added by Simon the Just, by whom the Canon was finally closed. Were this an indubitable fact, there would be little occasion to pursue this enquiry further; since we should then have the Book of Daniel, as a part of the authorised Scriptures, traced up to a period so near the times of Daniel the prophet, that forgery would be well nigh, if not absolutely impossible, and certainly objectless.[1] But this tradition is incapable of any positive proof; and perhaps the more probable view is, that the formation of the canonical books into one recognised whole was a gradual process[2] extending over several generations; the precise date of its final completion not being discoverable, but not being later than early in the second century B.C.,[3] from which time forward the Old Testament appears as a whole.

Since then there is this doubt hanging over the whole question of the Canon's formation, we are compelled to carry our investigation further than would otherwise be

[1] Unless the book crept into the Canon subsequently, which under any circumstances would be difficult; but that it could be effected in the teeth of a surveillance which proved an effectual barrier to the admission of the Apocryphal books—a surveillance, too, maintained by the Jews at Babylon and Alexandria, as well as by those in Palestine—and yet without exciting suspicion among any, is, I think, more than anyone can be fairly expected to believe without a particle of evidence to support it.

[2] The writer of the article on the 'Canon' in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible [ii. (*a*)] advocates this view, while in an article on 'Ezra' the soundness of the tradition is maintained. Hengstenberg also (on Daniel, *ut supra*, pp. 202–205, Eng. Transl.) argues at considerable length in favour of the latter view; as does Hävernick as well. (Einleit. I. i. § 7, 8, 9.)

[3] See Davidson, Biblical Criticism, vol. i. chap. vi. pp. 103, &c.; he fixes on B.C. 200 as the latest date.

Digitized by Google

necessary; and we next proceed to enquire how far the Book of Daniel can be traced, as an acknowledged part of inspired Scripture, even though the existence of the subsequent united Canon may not be actually discoverable.

Of the literature of the Jews belonging to the period immediately preceding the Christian era, so little survived the dispersion under Titus and persecution under Adrian,[1] that it would be nothing surprising if there were an entire absence of all evidence such as we have shown to be furnished by the writers of the New Testament, or by Josephus and others at a slightly later period. Still, notwithstanding this dearth, there are materials sufficient for our purpose.

The first Book of Maccabees, which is acknowledged[2] to be a most valuable and accurately written production, from internal evidence, may be safely regarded as having been written not later than B.C. 107.[3] The author of this book, besides referring to Daniel by name, and to his deliverance from the den of lions,[4] further appropriates the language of the Book of Daniel, in instances so numerous and expressions so peculiar,[5] as do not leave room for a doubt that he regarded the book as divinely inspired; and indeed Hengstenberg[6] considers that he makes it his special aim to show the

[1] See Arnald's Dissertation on the Two Books of Maccabees.

[2] Michaelis, Introduction to New Testament, vol. i. p. 71.

[3] See Tregelles on Daniel, p. 238, and footnote *ibid.*

[4] 1 Macc. ii. 60.

[5] Instances of this are given by Hengstenberg and Tregelles; but they cannot fail to strike any reader who will compare the books.

[6] Hengstenberg on the Authenticity of Daniel, chap. iii. § ii. 3, p. 208, Engl. Transl. Arnald (Dissertation on the Two Books of Maccabees) calls the whole book 'a key to the mysteries in the eighth and eleventh chapters of Daniel.'

Digitized by Google

fulfilment of the prophecies of Daniel in the events he records.[1]

We pass on now to the age of Judas Maccabæus, or rather earlier than the middle of the second century B.C. By that champion of the Jewish faith, the temple worship at Jerusalem, and other sacred institutions connected therewith, which had been interrupted or broken up by the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, were fully restored to the state in which they were subsequently preserved.[2] Among the items included in that restoration, there can be no doubt that a copy of the books of Scripture would be one;[3] if, as is probable from the nature of the Antiochian persecution, they had been for a time scattered, and in some cases lost.[4] At any rate, we may regard the Canon from that period forward as having had the sanction of Judas Maccabæus. Now either the Book of Daniel was included in that Maccabæan Canon, or it was not. If the latter were the case, there are then only two modes by which we can account for its presence there at the commencement of the Christian era; viz. by supposing that, some time in the interval, it either crept in surreptitiously, or was admitted authoritatively. That the latter should have been effected without any notice of it, either historical or traditional, having survived to our own day, seems in itself most improbable; yet nowhere is there a hint

[1] The circumstance above alluded to (p. 180 and note 1 *ibid.*) of Nehumias's calculating the date of the Messiah's coming from the prophecies of this book, shows that the book was acknowledged as inspired at that period.

[2] 2 Macc. ii. 14.

[3] Tomline, Elements of Theology, part i. chap. i. vol. i. p. 11; and Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Canon,' ii. (*a*), note c.

[4] The books of the law are expressly said to have been destroyed (1 Macc. i. 54, 55, 57) by the agents of Antiochus.

Digitized by Google

discoverable of any, even the slightest, knowledge of such a proceeding; while the antagonism of the two great sects in the Jewish Church, the Pharisees and Sadducees, which took their rise certainly not later than the times of the Maccabees,[1] and the jealous watchfulness with which they regarded each other and those Scriptures which were the common ground[2] of their disputes, would prove an effectual barrier to any alteration in the Canon, at least so great an one as the introduction of an additional book, whether that were sought to be effected by authority or otherwise;[3] the want of harmony between them preventing the one, as their mutual jealousy would the other. On these grounds alone we might conclude, with the highest degree of probability, that the Canon of Scripture underwent no change in the interval between the date of the temple-service's restoration by Judas Maccabæus and the beginning of the Christian era; and therefore, that, at the beginning of the former date, as at the latter, the Book of Daniel stood as a part of it; an assumption which amounts to a certainty when we bear

[1] Josephus (J. A. lib. xiii. c. v. § 9) first mentions them in the high-priesthood of Jonathan Maccabæus, who held office, B.C. 153–144.

[2] Though the Sadducees rejected all *precepts* not contained in the Law of Moses, yet there is no evidence to shew that they actually rejected all Scripture except the Pentateuch; on the contrary, the fact that Gamaliel in reasoning with them quotes other parts, proves the reverse. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Canon,' ii. (β).

[3] The character of some of the contents of the Book of Daniel would alone be a security against its obtaining the recognition of the Sadducees, if it were attempted to be introduced during this period. For would they who denied the resurrection, and the existence of angel or spirit, quietly acquiesce in the canonisation of a book which contained the strongest passages in support of these doctrines, if an argument could be found against it—such argument, too, being ready at hand, if the book had never belonged to the Canon before?

Digitized by Google

in mind the manner in which the book is referred to (as shewn above), in the second century B.C., by the author of the first Book of Maccabees; his references plainly implying that no doubt existed, in his day, as to its being the production of an inspired prophet;[1] and such a belief being inconsistent with any doubt as to the truth of its own claim to be the work of the Daniel of the Captivity.

Thus the Jewish testimony to the book's genuineness, implied, as before stated, by its presence in the Canon, is found to be as decidedly in its favour in the middle of the second century B.C. as it was at the commencement of the Christian era.

And here another argument presents itself. The death of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 164) occurred only three years before that of Judas Maccabæus himself. Now the Book of Daniel contains[2] descriptions of the events of his (Antiochus's) reign, so minutely exact in their details, that they have furnished ground for the allegation that they are not predictions, but accounts written after the events had taken place.[3] This is, indeed, an

[1] The value of this belief, as evidence in the book's favour, is not small, when we bear in mind that it was not a hastily formed persuasion. The fact that the spurious productions, 'The History of Susannah,' 'The Story of Bel and the Dragon,' and 'The Song of the Three Children,' though attempted to be attached to the Book of Daniel — that attempt itself showing the value set on the book — were never anciently recognised as either an original part of it, or as inspired Scripture at all [see Horne's Introd., Ayre's ed. p. 852–3], shews the care with which the acknowledged Scriptures were guarded, and how difficult it was for a book to obtain recognition as such, if it did not justly merit the distinction.

[2] In chapters viii. xi. xii.

[3] 'Nothing can be plainer,' says Ewald, 'than that the book was written B.C. 167–6' (die Propheten der Alten Bunds, ii. 560 ff.; see also De Wette, § 255, b. pp. 384–5). This has been the common charge of the book's opponents in all ages, from Porphyry downwards.

Digitized by Google

assertion incapable of being proved, but supposing (for the moment) that it were so, then, if the book stood in the Canon as it was sanctioned by Judas Maccabæus—which, for the reasons above stated, we are justified in assuming as certain,—the opposite hypothesis too being involved in insurmountable difficulties,—we are driven to the absurd conclusion that the book must have been admitted into the Canon within, at the most, three years of the date of its composition; or, in other words, that a book was acknowledged as inspired, which was known —as in that case it *must* have been[1]—to have been produced within the last three years, yet claiming a remote antiquity. This were not only to believe inspiration guilty of a lie, but to assume that they who had but just emerged from a struggle, in which they had, as it were, endorsed the sacred records in characters written with their blood, were notwithstanding guilty of the most culpable neglect and indifference towards those very Scriptures for which they had suffered so much; a view too palpably absurd to be entertained for a moment. But, on the contrary, we may be perfectly certain that Judas Maccabæus, on his restoration of the temple service, with all the attendant appliances, only acknowledged as Scripture those books which he had been taught to regard as such before the persecution of Antiochus, and —measuring the fulness of his convictions by the determinate stand he had made in their defence—of whose truth and inspiration he had no doubt. Apart, then, from any further considerations, it is quite clear that

[1] From 1 Macc. vii. 12 it would seem that scribes were numerous in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; and if so, they would certainly be acquainted with the literary events of the day; hence, their chief occupation being the study of the sacred records, no such innovation as that here alluded to could have escaped detection.

Digitized by Google

the Book of Daniel—to be in the Canon before the death of Judas Maccabæus (as we have seen that it must have been), must also have been composed before the events of the reign of Antiochus had actually taken place; since, had it been of so recent production, as the contrary hypothesis requires, the circumstance could not but have been known,[1] and its exclusion from the Canon therefore certain; while there is undoubted evidence that there was no knowledge among the Jews of the existence of a prophet among them at that time, but a manifest consciousness of the reverse. But if this be so, the book's descriptions of the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and earlier, being not historical records of the past, but predictions of the future, their minute accuracy at once indisputably proves their inspiration; i.e. their author must have been a prophet.

I pause at this point in the enquiry, to show, in confirmation of what has just been said, that there is also another line of reasoning, though similar in its character, by which we are brought to the same position at which the argument for the book's genuineness now stands. It is briefly this:—Bishop Newton[2] states that the design of his work on prophecy is to furnish a reply to those who (like Porphyry, Collins, and others) have sought to invalidate the authority of Scripture, by alleging that the portions professing to be prophecy were really historical descriptions of past events. Although, he reasons, such assertions are incapable of proof, yet they may be invested with a degree of plausibility sufficient to render them dangerous: and, therefore, waiving these disputed parts of Scripture, he seeks to

[1] This appears from 1 Macc. iv. 44, 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41.

[2] See Dedicatory Epistle and Introduction to Newton on the Prophecies; as also the Introduction to the Boyle Lecture, *et alibi.*

Digitized by Google

show that there yet remain many others, the fulfilment of which, as happening either in our own times, or at least long after the passages were *known* to have been written, proves beyond a doubt that, whatever may be alleged of the former, these must have been inspired. Among those books from which he adduces prophecies, fulfilled or fulfilling in ages undeniably subsequent to their composition, is the Book of Daniel. On these grounds, then, apart from the position or existence of the book prior to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, we are justified in ranking the Book of Daniel among the inspired prophecies; and thus we arrive at the same conclusion as before.

From this point the genuineness of the book is capable of proof by three different lines of reasoning.

(i.) The book itself claims to be the production of the Daniel of the Captivity. If the book is inspired, that claim must be true; God being incapable of a lie. The inspiration of the book, then, having been shewn to be beyond a doubt, since no author could have produced such a work except God were with him; the truth of the claim necessarily follows; i.e. the book is genuine.

(ii.) The second line of argument depends chiefly on the correctness of the Jewish tradition, that the gift of prophecy ceased with Malachi—'A Malachiâ ad Johannem Christi Baptistam nulli Prophetæ exstitere.'[1] Assuming that tradition as true, which we are justified

[1] Genebrardus, Chron. ad. an. M. 3640, p. 186. We find this tradition in Josephus cont. Ap. lib. i. § 8; allusions are also evidently made to it, as to something well known, in 1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41. It is noted too by the author of the book Cosri, by the Talmudists (Hengstenberg, *ut supra*. chap. iii. § ii. 1). See also Vitringa de defect. Proph. obs. sacr. iv. 6, ap. Keil, Einleit. § 158, 6, and the authorities referred to by Bishop Cosin on the Canon, §§ iv. xxi. xxiv. liii lxxx. lxxxviii.

Digitized by Google

in doing, from the general credence it appears in all ages to have obtained, it follows that the author of the Book of Daniel, having been proved to be a prophet, must have lived and written not later than the time of Malachi, or not much more than a century[1] after the Babylonian Captivity; i.e. at a date when forgery, had it been attempted, would have been most difficult, if not absolutely impossible, and when there could have been no sufficient advantage to be gained by it to induce any one to attempt an undertaking so difficult and unsatisfactory. Again, therefore, we arrive at the same conclusion as before, viz. that the Book of Daniel must be the genuine production of the author whose work it claims to be.

These two lines of reasoning however depend mainly, not upon external and historic evidence, such as the present division of this work has especially to deal with, but rather upon the proved *prophetic* nature of the book itself.

(iii.) There remains still, in the third place, historical testimony, sufficient in itself, independently of the two last considerations, to establish the genuineness of the book, at least to the highest degree of probability, amounting to little short of moral certainty. I proceed to shew what it is.

We return to the era of Judas Maccabæus. From the peculiar difficulties which would, at and after that date, beset any attempt to alter the Canon, and from the nature of the references to the Book of Daniel contained in the 1st Book of Maccabæus, I have argued above, that there could be no doubt that the canonical books

[1] See Browne, Ordo Sæclorum, part ii. chap. ii. § 336. Usher makes Malachi contemporary with Nehemiah, and to have written about B.C. 416.

Digitized by Google

were then precisely what they were seen to be at the commencement of the Christian era; or, in other words, that the Book of Daniel, as one of them, was at that time in a position which implied that it was, and had long been, *regarded* as an inspired production, and therefore genuine. That this was the conviction not only of the author of the first Book of Maccabees, but of the Jews of that day generally, is evident from his account of the death of Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, who is represented [1] as inciting his sons, on his death-bed, to a zealous defence of their faith by reminding them of the examples held out by their fathers; and among the remarkable circumstances he enumerates are the deliverance of Ananias, Azarias, and Mishael from the furnace, and that of Daniel from the lion's den. Now, from an examination of the whole passage, it appears that the other events referred to are all taken from the acknowledged books of Scripture,[2] and consequently we may assume that these two instances were no exception. But where are they recorded except in the Book of Daniel? If therefore this account be a true one, it follows that the Book of Daniel was recognised as an authoritative revelation at the date of the death of Mattathias, B.C. 166. Supposing, on the other hand, that the narrative be not strictly accurate in all its details, and that these words were only put into the mouth of Mattathias by the writer of the Book of Maccabees,—which is the allegation of Bleek,[3]—it still remains a fact that that writer saw nothing *incongruous* in representing Mattathias as quoting the Book of Daniel, which could not have been the case had he

[1] 1 Macc. ii. 4–68.

[2] They are from Gen., Numb., Josh., 2 Sam., 2 Kings.

[3] Bleek, Einleit. p. 183.

Digitized by Google

known the book to be of recent production. In other words he was himself persuaded, as he knew all would be, who might read that account, that in the age of Mattathias the Book of Daniel was regarded as Scripture. Now the opinion of a writer so worthy of credit, as he confessedly is,[1] is not to be hastily set aside. Living as he did so near the period of which we are speaking, he could not be well mistaken on such a matter; while the manner in which he intimates his own belief also implies that it was the common belief of all Jews of that day.

A further confirmation of this is to be found in the fact that the Book of Baruch, which belongs to the Maccabæan period, also makes use of the Book of Daniel, as is to be seen by a comparison of chapters i. and ii. with Daniel ix.[2] But we can proceed further than this. The Book of Daniel is known, and acknowledged on all hands, to have stood in the LXX. version of the Scriptures. Now the author of the 'Prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus,' the oldest of the apocryphal books, speaks thrice within a few lines of the Scriptures under their threefold division of the 'law, the prophets, and the other books,' and evidently implies that in his day, and in that of his grandfather also, the translation of the whole body of those Scriptures was completed. The latest date to which we can assign this prologue is 130 B.C. the book itself being written fifty years earlier, or 180 B.C. There are indeed strong reasons for believing that the true dates are considerably earlier then these;[3] but, to take this lowest calculation, we

[1] Michaelis, *ut supra*, vol. i. p. 71.

[2] See Horne's Introduction, Ayre's ed. p. 846.

[3] Tregelles (on Daniel, p. 253, note at foot) shows that it is more than likely that the book was written as far back as the beginning of the *third* century B.C.

Digitized by Google

have here evidence, that the LXX. was completed not later than early in the second century B. C. The Book of Daniel,[1] therefore, as forming part of that collection, must also have been translated before that period; and inasmuch as it is not at all likely that the *version* would be made until a considerable interval had elapsed after the composition of the original,[2]—since too, that original was deemed worthy of being translated with the other acknowledged books of Scripture, and therefore must, like them, have been at that period regarded as inspired, which it would not have been, had it been known to be of recent production—the untruthfulness of its claim to be the work of Daniel being in that case transparent—we have in all this evidence sufficient to prove that the original[3] Hebrew edition must have belonged to a considerably earlier date still.

The piece of evidence which next presents itself, is the statement of Josephus,[4] that the Book of Daniel was shown by the High Priest Jaddua to Alexander the Great, on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem, in the year 332 B. C., in consequence of the prophecies it

[1] Though the Book of Ecclesiasticus makes no direct mention of the Book of Daniel, yet it is considered by some that there are indications of the writer's acquaintance with it in the two following passages—chap. x. 8, comp. Dan. viii. 23; and chap. xvii. 17, comp. Dan. x. 20, 21, xii. 1.—Rawlinson's Bamp. Lect. V. note 7.

[2] The notorious badness of the *original* LXX. translation (for the one now found in the LXX. is a later and better version by Theodotion) would also imply that a considerable time had elapsed between the date of its formation and that of the Hebrew, or why should the latter have been so misunderstood.

[3] Michaelis has proved that the Hebrew and Chaldee text was the original, and older than the Greek version. Bibliothek Orient. vol. iv. An English version of this proof is to be found in Apthorp, Discourses on Prophecy, vol. i. pp. 244–250.

[4] J. A. lib. xl. c. viii. § 5.

Digitized by Google

contained bearing upon that power, of which he was even then understood to be the representative. The truth of this statement has been impugned, but—as is shewn by Hengstenberg at considerable length[1]—without any just ground; there being rather strong reasons for considering it to be accurately true. Assuming then that this was an historical fact, we have the Book of Daniel recognised as the work of an inspired prophet at a period which may be fairly pronounced to be *biblical*; for Jaddua was the last High Priest mentioned in the Scriptures of the Old Testament; his name closing the list found in Neh. xii. 10, 11, and

[1] On the Authenticity of Daniel, chap. iii. § iv. 1. The chief difficulty in the passage is the statement that Alexander, after the capture of Tyre, advanced upon Gaza, subsequently marched to Jerusalem, and thence into Egypt. It is argued (1) that these movements are so unreasonable, Jerusalem lying *between* Tyre and Gaza, that the account must be false; (2) that other historical authorities describe him as proceeding *direct* from Gaza into Egypt. In answer it may be observed that (1) the very improbability which at first sight attaches to these movements rather confirms the truth of the account. Since it is not to be supposed that Josephus, a native of Judea, would have committed so flagrant a geographical blunder as to describe the conqueror as reaching Gaza from Tyre, sooner than Jerusalem, unless he had good reasons for knowing that it was so. The unusualness of the movements would therefore really imply a more accurate knowledge on his part than other authorities display. While (2) the greater importance of Gaza would render it natural that Alexander should go thither first, in the hope that Jerusalem and other places of less importance would yield the more readily when that place had been taken. The omission in other writers of all mention of the visit to Jerusalem—they making Alexander proceed direct from Gaza into Egypt—being an argument *ex silentio*, is really of little importance; the omission of the mention of events which, at the most, occupied only a few days, being not remarkable, when we remember the far more important circumstances which remained for the historian to record. For further arguments, see Hengstenberg, l. c.

Digitized by Google

occurring again in verse 22 of the same chapter; both passages inserted in all probability by Simon the Just the grandson of this Jaddua, whose sanction and revision we may also consider the book to have received, so far as he gave them to the books of the Old Testament generally. This act of Jaddua is tantamount to a declaration of the book's genuineness, since it is clear that he regarded it as inspired, and its inspiration involves the truth of its claim to be the production of Daniel, while Jaddua also lived at a date and occupied a position which would secure him from being deceived. For the book is thus traced up to a period but little more than 80 years later than the time of Nehemiah and Malachi. If, again, the book had been first published later than their day, it were impossible that, in the remaining interval, it could have obtained credence so completely as to be acknowledged and singled out by the High Priest Jaddua, the ordained conservator of the sacred records, as a divine revelation. And thus the book is carried back further still; even to the days when prophecy had not yet ceased, and when men still lived in Israel, who were capable of pronouncing on the truth of its claim with all the certainty of inspiration. Under these circumstances, that it was not rejected implies that from the very first it must have been recognised as beyond a doubt what it claimed itself to be, the genuine production of the Daniel of the Captivity. If to this we add the circumstance already mentioned,[1] that there are also traces in three of the latest books of the Old Testament Canon, viz. Zechariah, Ezra, and Nehemiah, of an acquaintance with and use of the book, in the composition of their own

[1] Part I. pp. 11, 12. See Auberlen on Daniel and the Apocalypse, Eng. Transl. pp. 47 and 130–1.

Digitized by Google

works, we have traced it up to the very times of those who were contemporary with Daniel himself, and found it acknowledged by them as an authoritative revelation.

Such are the leading historical arguments for the book's genuineness which we possess. There are other minor and subsidiary considerations, leading to the same conclusions, which are to be found in the pages of those who have treated on this subject at greater length than it is possible to do here. Sufficient however has, I think, been advanced, to shew to the satisfaction of any mind not utterly impervious to argument, or hopelessly blinded by prejudice, that the position of the book, as the genuine production of Daniel, is, *historically* considered, quite unassailable. Those who are not convinced by the unbroken thread of testimony here presented to them, would scarcely be persuaded though one rose from the dead. Nay the dead have been made to speak, and their witness agreeth.

To sum up:—It has been demonstrated, (i.) on different, though analogous grounds, that the book is undeniably the work of *a prophet.* Can we suppose it possible that a prophet, and one so distinguished as the author of this book must unquestionably have been, would have claimed to be what he was not? This were to fly in the face of all those divine denunciations against false witness in general, and false prophets in particular, which had been so solemnly pronounced on different occasions by the word of God. Apart from its sinfulness, which alone would, in such an one, render it sufficiently improbable to justify our rejection of the supposition, it were voluntarily, yet without any discoverable object, to give the lie to his own mission, and in case of the fraud's detection, to create a most serious ground of prejudice against his own book, and to involve

Digitized by Google

its acceptance in difficulties, for which not only was there no counterbalancing advantage to accrue, but no perceptible advantage at all. In short, as the work of a prophet, its author—for these reasons alone, even were there no more—could but be one, the Daniel of the Captivity. This, however, was shewn to receive confirmation of the greatest importance, from the fact that a tradition, too generally accepted to be without foundation, existed from the earliest times among the Jews, that no prophet had lived subsequently to the *age of Malachi;* thus narrowing the limits within which the book, proved to be the book of a prophet, could have been produced, to a period of not more than a century; and that at a time when—the memory of Daniel himself being still fresh, and there being those alive who could pronounce with certainty on the book's merits—the difficulty attending the attempt to foist such a production on the world as genuine, if it were spurious, would have been great in the extreme, if not absolutely insurmountable.

(ii.) It has been shewn that at different intervals of time, reaching up from the Christian era even to *the age of Daniel himself*, or of his contemporaries, the book was recognised and used as an authoritative revelation. The mere absence of any doubt, expressed or implied, of a book's genuineness from the earliest times in which a judgement could be formed, is in *all* cases admitted as very strong evidence in its favour. There are, however, peculiar circumstances connected with the particular book under consideration, which render this testimony in the present instance more than usually strong. For the very fact of the book claiming to belong to the age of the Captivity would itself place a very great hindrance in the way of its

Digitized by Google

acceptance, if published at any subsequent date, that claim at once challenging criticism, suggesting the inquiry, why the book had not obtained circulation before, and thus rendering detection, if the book were spurious, more certain; and in case of its later production being discovered, stamping it at once as unworthy of credit in other respects as well. Nor, in the present case, would this be an ordeal to be encountered only once. For even if the book were accepted by the Jews of Palestine, their brethren of Alexandria needed to be satisfied as well; and were both deceived, there yet remained the task of convincing the Jews in Babylon, the locality to which the book laid claim, and where traditions concerning Daniel would be longer cherished and more numerous, and the means for detection in case of forgery multiplied in proportion.

The fact then that, notwithstanding all this, the book still passed muster, as an authoritative production, is tantamount to the testimony of all Jews, Palestinian, Babylonian, and Alexandrian, in its favour: and in the mouth of these three classes of witnesses, must its truth, and therein its genuineness, be regarded as incontestably established.

Thus have I passed under review, in the three parts into which it naturally divides itself, the whole body of evidence on this subject, the genuineness of the Book of Daniel. The *antecedent probability* found to exist strongly predisposed us for the book's recognition as being what it professed to be. The *internal evidence*, so far as the book could substantiate its own claim, fully justified us in yielding it that recognition.

The *historical evidence* has shown that from the Christian era upwards, through all those times most capable of pronouncing a judgement, and in which

Digitized by Google

fraud were the most sure of detection, that recognition has been fully accorded by others; and *that*, as incidentally pointed out by the way, with the best possible grounds of so doing.

'A three-fold cord is not quickly broken.'[1] With such a combination of evidence,—the various argumentary threads employed all blending together in unison, and, if followed up, leading to the same result—it were almost impossible to conceive a stronger confirmation of the book's claim to be the genuine production of Daniel than we have here.[2] Nor should it shake our conviction, if some, having but inadequately examined the testimony existing in the book's support, or by prejudice, or otherwise incapacitated to form a just judgement, have not admitted that claim. A veil has been upon the heart, in the study of God's Word, in other ages than our own. Why should Daniel escape what Moses has incurred? It has perhaps been reserved for our own day, though even this is not without precedent, to exhibit the lowest form of unfaith, when they, as it were, of God's 'own household,' are among the assailants of His Word; yet this too was among the events that might, in some degree be anticipated. There are to be seasons when even, 'the very elect,' the inmost circle of 'them that are His,' should if it were possible be deceived.[3] As the consummation approaches, as the eternal plot is thickening, shall we deem it strange, if some betray their weakness? Rather should it be matter of gratitude, that among ourselves, at least,

[1] Eccles. iv. 12.

[2] 'Of the genuineness and authenticity of the Book of Daniel we have every possible evidence, both external and internal.'—Horne's Introd., Ayre's ed. p. 842.

[3] Matt. xxiv. 24.

Digitized by Google

they do not prove more numerous. The secret of this disaffection is to be found in the spirit of the times. It is of God's ordaining that the very increase of our knowledge should bring new trials in its wake. Faith and intelligence dissevered are a house divided against itself. The one predominant may breed superstition, the other, a presumptuous meddling with things beyond the mere human capacity to grasp. But the spiritual vision diseased, and distorting the true proportions of things, can furnish no just criterion for the healthy sight—the heart that even in its intellectual conceptions, is 'purified by faith.' To Daniel himself it was declared by an angel,[1] that only 'the wise shall understand.' *That* true wisdom is from above. And in perusing the Word of God, if we would do so to the fullest advantage, there must be the same Spirit of truth animating ourselves Who also breathes in that Book. 'In God's light, we shall see light.'[2] But 'if the light within' us 'be darkness,' then in regard to God's Word we are, from inherent incapacity, but as the Egyptians compared with God's own people with respect to that miraculous pillar in the wilderness; it was a cloud and darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night to these.'[3]

[1] Daniel xii. 10. [2] Ps. xxxvi. 9. [3] Ex. xiv. 20.

3 DE63

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

EDMONDS & REMNANTS,
BINDERS.

Digitized by Google